



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2022

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3302033

27 Furzeham Road, Hillingdon, West Drayton UB7 9DD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Muhammed Salim Miah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 71589/APP/2022/475, dated 15 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of single-storey rear and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Furzeham Road is a residential cul-de-sac lined by uniform pairs of two-storey, semi-detached dwellings of traditional construction. The form, scale, and traditional architectural detailing of the semi-detached pairs contributes positively and distinctively to the character and appearance of the area. The appeal property is typical of this character.
4. The proposed wrap-around extensions would be confined to the ground floor level and would be set back from the front elevation. Nonetheless, through their combined width and depth, the extensions would represent an addition of considerable size relative to the existing property and would fail to reflect the original plan form. Indeed, the Council advises that the scheme fails to comply with a number of detailed criteria set out in Policy DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) (the DMP), including in respect of its overall width and projection. As a result, the development could be fairly labelled as disproportionate.
5. Furthermore, the form of the extension would result in an awkward roof arrangement with different roof forms and shallow pitches that would not match the main building. Nor would the size and design of the window in its front elevation suitably reflect the window composition and hierarchy of the main front elevation. Overall, the proposal is not a well-designed and sympathetic addition to the host property.

6. I have taken into account that the appeal property is located at the end of the street and the limited public viewpoints from which the development would be seen as a result; although that does not negate the impact that the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the host dwelling itself. Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) emphasises that the creation of high quality, beautiful buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. In addition, Framework paragraph 130 states that development should be visually attractive, sympathetic to local character, and add to the overall quality of the area. Moreover, Framework paragraph 134 is clear that development that is not well designed should be refused.
7. For all these reasons, I conclude that the development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property and its immediate surroundings. It is contrary to DMP Policy DMHD1 which, amongst other things, requires that alterations and extensions respect the design of the original house. The proposal also conflicts with DMP Policy DMHB11, and Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (2012) in so far as they require new development, including extensions, to be well designed and to harmonise with the local context. There is also conflict with the Framework in respect of achieving good design.

Other Matters

8. The development would not result in the loss of any landscape features and I note that the Council raises no objection in respect of effects on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, or in terms of parking and highway safety. I also recognise that the proposal would provide extended living accommodation for the occupiers. Nonetheless, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified and the conflict with the development plan and Framework as a whole.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR