



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2025 by S Indermaur

Decision by B Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3354748

87 Wimborne Avenue, Hillingdon, Hayes UB4 0HH

- 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 Jinderpal Hayer against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 14548/APP/2024/1563.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the immediate street scene and wider surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semidetached dwelling that is located within a corner plot and situated at a junction. The dwelling is seen within a pair as they share similar materials, fenestration and a façade with an asymmetrical catslide roof that is set forward of the rest of the dwelling. The property has an existing single storey side and rear extension with a hip to gable roof extension and large rear dormer. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character and comprises mostly two storey semi-detached properties. The site retains a degree of balance with its semi-detached pair and therefore makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
5. The additional bulk of the proposal, in combination with the existing extensions together would not be subordinate to the original dwelling. The cumulative impact of the proposed side extension with the existing, roof and dormer extensions would overwhelm the character of the original property. The result would be that the accumulation of extensions would appear as oppressive and dominant in the context of the existing dwelling. The proposal would therefore visually detract from, and not respect the design of the existing dwelling. Furthermore, considering the

mass and bulk of the adjacent structure, the proposal would appear as disproportionate and would further unbalance the semi-detached pair of properties.

6. Policy DMHD1 Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies 2020 (LP) states that where hip to gable roof extensions exist, a two-storey side extension will not be supported. A combination of both forms of extension would be likely to create a mass that would over-dominate the original form of the dwelling. As such, the proposal would directly conflict with this Policy. Due to the appeal site's position on a corner plot, the proposal would be highly visible from several vantage points. The existing roof, in combination with the proposed roof form would create a disjointed and awkward design. Accordingly the multiple roof forms, including the existing gable roof and dormer and the proposed hip roof form, would be prominent within the street scene and would appear as visually inharmonious.
7. For the reasons outlined above, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the immediate street scene and wider surrounding area. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the LP. Together these Policies, among other matters, outline that extensions should achieve high quality design and integrate with the local context by taking into account the surrounding form, scale and layout.
8. The proposal also does not comply with Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021) which states that development proposals should enhance local context by delivering buildings that positively responds to local distinctiveness through their scale and appearance.

Other Matters

9. The Council have mentioned conflict with The London Plan (2021), specifically Policy D4 which primarily relates to the design process and scrutiny. This Policy is principally strategic in nature and therefore has not been decisive in my findings.
10. My attention has been drawn to a number of extensions built within the area. Although several of these have been provided with a decision notice, the submitted evidence does not include the considerations that formed part of the Council's decision. Furthermore, I note that one property referenced excludes a rear box dormer and another was approved in 2018 and therefore determined in a different policy context.
11. In any case, from my own observations these extensions do not reflect the prevailing character of the immediate street scene and area. Also, most of these do not appear to be local to the appeal site and thus do not inform its immediate character and thus the previously approved extensions do not weigh strongly in favour of the proposed scheme. In any event, each case must be considered on its own merits and this matter does not mitigate the unequivocal conflict with the LP.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. The proposal would conflict with the development plan read as a whole and there are no material considerations that justify granting permission. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Indermaur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

B Plenty

INSPECTOR