

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 March 2024

**by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 4 April 2024**

---

## **Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3336201**

### **2 Rochester Road, Northwood, Hillingdon, HA6 1NH**

- 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 K Sudagaran against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref 1383/APP/2023/2294, dated 2 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 10 October 2023.
  - The development proposed is additional light rear addition to the existing single storey rear extension.
- 

## **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## **Procedural Matters**

2. The extension the subject of this appeal has been constructed in part and is referred to below as the development.

## **Main Issue**

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

## **Reasons**

4. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling located in a residential area.
  5. The surrounding area is characterised by the presence of semi-detached dwellings set back from the road behind gardens and/or parking areas and with longer gardens to the rear. The setting-back of dwellings and the presence of gardens and trees provides for a green and spacious local character.
  6. During my site visit, I observed that many dwellings in the area have been altered and/or extended and that such changes generally appear in keeping with the host property and local character.
  7. The development the subject of this appeal comprises a ground floor rear extension to an existing rear extension. The development extends across the full width of the appeal property and as an extension to an existing extension, it
-

projects a considerable distance to the rear of the appeal dwelling and significantly beyond the neighbouring ground floor rear extension to Number 4.

8. I find that the above results in a development that appears large and cumbersome. The development's width and considerable projection results in an extension of such overall scale as to unduly dominate the appearance of and fail to appear subordinate to, the host property.
9. Furthermore, as a result of it extending well beyond the rear elevation of the adjacent rear extension at No 4, the development fails to appear in harmony with the appeal dwelling's attached neighbour.
10. I find that the harm arising as a result of the above is exacerbated as a result of the design of the development. Seen together with the pre-existing rear extension, the development results in a rear extension with a part flat roof and a part sloping roof and this results in an awkward relationship, whereby the roof of the development visually jars with that of the pre-existing rear extension.
11. In addition to all of the above, during my site visit it was apparent to me that no similar developments are visible within the area surrounding the development and that consequently, the development draws attention to itself as an incongruous feature.
12. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the development harms the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to London Plan (2021) Policy D3; to Local Plan<sup>1</sup> Policy BE1; and to Development Management<sup>2</sup> Policies DMHB11 and DMHD1, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

### **Other Matters**

13. The appellant, in support of the proposal, draws attention to other developments elsewhere. However, the developments and the circumstances relating to these developments do not appear to be so similar to the appeal before me as to provide for direct comparison. In any case, I have found that the proposed development would harm local character and the impacts of this harm are not reduced by the presence of other developments elsewhere.

### **Conclusion**

14. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

*N McGurk*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> Reference: Hillingdon Local Plan Part One – Strategic Policies (2012).

<sup>2</sup> Reference: Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020).