



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2025

by **E Heron MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3354514

1 Peel Way, Hillingdon, Uxbridge, Middlesex, UB8 3RL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Amit Sharma against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 14702/APP/2024/1721.
 - The development proposed is 1st floor side extension over previously approved ground floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Both parties have noted that the ground floor element of the proposed extension benefits from a recent planning consent. Therefore, the focus of my decision is the proposed first floor side extension, within the context of the previously approved ground floor extension.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the existing property and the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is within a suburban, residential area of predominantly semi-detached, two storey houses. There is a cohesion in their scale and massing, and their set-back from the pavement behind gardens and driveways in a general staggered arrangement. This pattern of development gives an overall sense of spaciousness. Corner plots set behind front and side gardens at road junctions provide an important contribution to this character. The underlying continuity provided by the set-back, flows from one street to the next, and they create an enhanced sense of openness at road junctions.
5. The appeal site makes a positive contribution to the open character of the area. The space around the dwelling affords a pleasant, relatively expansive view into and out of Normans Close. Despite this not being a through road, this spaciousness is still a cohesive element of the wider street scene. Whilst the flank wall does not strictly align with the return building line on Normans Close, it nonetheless follows the established modestly staggered arrangement of houses set behind front and side gardens.

6. If the ground floor extension, the subject of the extant planning permission, was to be built out, its side projection would diminish the gap at ground floor level. However, above ground floor, the openness and sense of space between Normans Close and Peel Way would be respected.
7. The first floor element would be a modest and subservient addition to the host dwelling, taken in the abstract. However, in this context, together with the additional encroachment of the ground floor extension into the side garden, the overall form, massing, height, and bulk of the dwelling would erode the openness around the corner plot, resulting in a cramped appearance. Moreover, it would harmfully reduce the sense of spacious cohesion between the properties on Normans Close and Peel Way.
8. I have taken account of No's 209 and 211 Pield Heath Road and viewed them when on site. Whilst the site context is different in so much as there is no return building line on Peel Way, the first-floor side extension of no 209 has a dominating effect and closes the gap when viewing Pield Heath Road from Peel Way. This is in marked contrast to the low-level and unassuming extension at no 211, that respects the sense of spaciousness above ground floor. Hence, the development at no 209 reinforces my concerns rather than providing a sound justification for similar development.
9. For these reasons, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing property and the street scene. As such it conflicts with Policy BE 1 of A Vision For 2026, Local Plan: Part 1, Strategic Policies, (adopted November 2012), and Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2, Development Management Policies (adopted 16 January 2020). These policies require a high quality of design that respects the character, appearance and quality of the dwelling and surroundings. Also, that new development enhances local distinctiveness.

Other Matters

10. It is acknowledged that the proposal would provide improved accommodation for the appellant and his family, however this is a private benefit which does not attract sufficient weight to overcome the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

E Heron

INSPECTOR