



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 8 March 2021

by Alexander O'Doherty LLB (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3267547

1A Bridge Way, Ickenham, Uxbridge UB10 8QR

- 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 Amjad Ali against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 43797/APP/2020/3249, dated 9 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension, rear infill extension and first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. A copy of the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions was requested from the Council. However, the Council advised that the document has been withdrawn. Consequently, I have not had regard to it in the consideration and determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey detached dwelling situated on a corner at the junction between Bridge Way and Long Lane, in a residential area. Although No 121 Long Lane is an exception to the rule, gaps between properties and their side boundaries, adjacent to the road, are common in the local area. These gaps, whilst only being one factor, do break up the mass of built form in the vicinity, and as such contribute to the provision of spaciousness in the area.
5. The infill extension proposed to the rear of the property would constitute a very minor alteration to the host property and as such it would not harm its character or appearance. The proposed first floor rear extension would cover the majority of the width of the rear elevation of the property. It would have a roof pitch which would be much shallower than the existing roof behind it. Nevertheless, as the extension would be at first floor level, the differences between the two roof forms would not be very noticeable when viewed from the rear garden of the host property. Furthermore, in my view the rear

- extension would not protrude from the host property by an excessive degree and overall it would have a limited scale. Accordingly, both these elements of the proposal would be acceptable, with respect to their impact on both the host property and the wider street scene.
6. The proposed single storey side extension would infill the whole of the area between the host property and the side boundary with Long Lane, and it would also extend along the full length of the side of the property. It would have a large crown roof which would be approximately 3.5 metres in height. Consequently, it would be a very substantially-sized addition to the host property, and would not be sufficiently subordinate to it. It is recognised that some of the extension would be below street level and that the hedgerow to the side of the plot would remain, but much of the extension would still be visible. As such, due to its considerable bulk and massing, the side extension would dominate the host property, and would serve to disrupt its current legible scale and coherent appearance.
 7. As the host property is situated in a prominent location, on a corner at a junction, this harm to the character and appearance of the host property would also lessen its positive role in the street scene. Accordingly, the side extension would also harm the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, the side extension would remove the important gap to the side of the plot, which would reduce the contribution that the appeal site makes to spaciousness in the area. In this respect the character of the area would also be harmed.
 8. I observed No 131 Long Lane but in my view the extension to that property is not of such a high quality of design that it should be replicated. I also observed the extension at No 119 Long Lane, but as it is positioned some distance from the junction with Long Lane, that extension is in a far less prominent position than the side extension would be at the appeal site, and accordingly it is not directly comparable. The appellant has referred to other examples of properties built up to the boundary line¹, but due to their distance from the appeal site, their contribution to the character of the surrounding area with respect to this appeal is limited. Hence, all those examples do not change my finding on this main issue.
 9. Thus, the single storey side extension would have an unacceptable and harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would conflict with Policy BE1 of the Local Plan: Part 1² and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Local Plan: Part 2³ which collectively require that all new developments should achieve a high quality of design which enhances the local distinctiveness of the area.

Other Matters

10. The proposal would improve the living accommodation available to the appellant. However, as this would mainly be a private benefit, this has been given limited weight, and it does not outweigh my findings on the main issue.

¹ Including: 23 Milton Road, 19 Milton Court, and Milton Road – Milton Court

² Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (adopted 2012)

³ Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (adopted 2020)

Conclusion

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

Alexander O'Doherty

INSPECTOR