
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2025

by **C Housden BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3357014

273 Balmoral Drive, Hayes, Hillingdon UB4 8DH

- 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 Manjit Rai against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 51060/APP/2024/2210.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a two-storey side, first floor rear wrap around extension and loft conversion incorporating a rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the proposed development differs between the application form and the decision notice. In the interests of clarity, I have taken the description of development from the application form which adequately describes the proposed development. I have however, removed reference to front rooflights from the description, as rooflights are not depicted in the proposed plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The area predominantly comprises two-storey semi-detached properties with consistent architectural features. Properties are set back from the road with open frontages and are organised in a uniform pattern, following a mostly linear building line. Corner plots are either orientated at an angle or have space adjacent to the side elevation which helps to create an open character and appearance at the junctions off Balmoral Drive. Trees are situated throughout the roadside. The area has a suburban character and appearance.
5. No 273 Balmoral Drive is a semi-detached two-storey property situated within a corner plot between Balmoral Drive and Hurstfield Crescent. The property has an open frontage and directly faces Balmoral Drive. The property also has open space to the side which contributes to an open character and provides separation to the adjacent pavement from built form. The open space to the side of No 273 also allows for views along Hurstfield Crescent.

6. The proposed two-storey side extension would have its front elevation set back from the existing building line of No 273 and, along with the first-floor rear extension, would have its ridge set down from the existing roof ridge line. However, the two-storey side and first-floor rear extension would be excessively wide and deep with a side elevation set close to the boundary wall. The width of the extension would exceed half the width of the original property which would not comply with the criteria set out in Policy DMHD 1. The resulting bulk and massing of the extension would not have a subservient appearance to the host dwelling and would be visually prominent within the streetscene to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.
7. The positive appearance of the appeal site as an open corner plot would also be diminished by the proposed extension breaking the return building line with the properties along Hurstfield Crescent. This would reduce the open appearance to the side of the appeal site and also affect the views down Hurstfield Crescent to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.
8. In relation to the proposed rear dormer, the Council has not included this element of the proposal in its reason for refusal. I also see no reason to raise an objection to this element of the development either, due to its subservient appearance. Nevertheless, whilst I may not find material harm on this issue, I have still found material harm to the character and appearance of the locality from the two-storey side and first-floor rear extension, and as such, the appeal cannot be viewed in a positive light.
9. For the reasons that I have given, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with Policy BE1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 – Development Management Policies (2020), which seek to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment, achieve high quality design and incorporate principles of good design within developments.

Other Matters

10. I have been supplied with evidence from the appellant of other extensions that they feel are similar to the current appeal and have been given approval by the Council. These share only a limited similarity in the context to this appeal. In my opinion, their presence points to a need for such proposals to be carefully controlled in order to protect the character and appearance of the area in that context.
11. In any case, I have considered the appeal before me on its individual planning merits and the presence of these examples do not persuade me that the appeal proposal is acceptable or otherwise justify the harm that I have identified in respect of the scheme.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, the proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Housden

INSPECTOR