

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2022

**by J Bowyer BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 7 October 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/22/3301457**

**46 Laurel Lane, West Drayton UB7 7TX**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission
  - The appeal is made by Mr Jawad Ahmed against the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref 17506/APP/2021/4043, is dated 1 November 2021.
  - The development proposed is two storey side and rear extension and single storey rear extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The Council did not determine the application within the prescribed period, but has provided an appeal statement advising that had it determined it, planning permission would have been refused. Having regard to the statement and the putative reason for refusal given by the Council, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

## Reasons

3. The appeal site includes a semi-detached dwelling at the junction of Berberis Walk with Laurel Lane. Closest to the site, these streets are predominantly characterised by semi-detached and terraced dwellings of similar original designs and proportions. For the most part, buildings are set close together. Nevertheless, relatively generous frontages and rear gardens, and increased spacing to the side of those buildings that are positioned on corners, including across wide verges, provide for a fairly spacious setting to development.
4. To the side of the appeal dwelling, the proposed extension would be closer to Berberis Walk than neighbouring buildings to the rear which face this street. However, the established building line along Berberis Walk is not uniform, with buildings stepping generally forward towards the junction, and the step forward of the appeal development would not be significantly larger than these steps. Taken in isolation, I do not therefore consider that the projection of the extension beyond the Berberis Walk building line would necessarily be unacceptable.
5. However, the extension would wrap around to the rear of the dwelling at two-storey level. Its width at the rear would be more than half the width of the host dwelling, contrary to one of the requirements for side extensions within Policy DMHD 1 of the Local Plan: Part 2 – Development Management Policies 2020 ('LPP2'), and it would also be of greater overall depth than the host

dwelling. I acknowledge that the gables to the side and rear of the extension would be consistent with the existing roof form, but they would be only slightly lower than the main roof and would add further bulk to the upper parts of the extension. Coupled with the large overall width and depth of the extensions relative to the host dwelling, I find that the proposal would result in an excessively bulky and disproportionate addition that would dominate the host dwelling. As a consequence, there would be detriment to its architectural integrity, character and appearance.

6. Moreover, the development would be visible from both Laurel Lane and Berberis Walk, and would be particularly prominent in views along Berberis Walk as a result of its position partly forward of the adjacent dwellings to the rear. In these views, I find that the large overall bulk and mass of the development would erode the distinctive spaciousness around the corner, and would stand out as a discordant and intrusive feature. The proposal would also therefore harm the character and appearance of its surroundings.
7. In support of the appeal, the appellant refers to two-storey extensions at 36 and 44 Laurel Lane. However, I saw that the extension at No 36 does not wrap around the rear of the host dwelling at two-storey level, and projects only a very modest distance beyond the first-floor rear building line. The extension to no 44 is only to the rear, and is less visible from the street given that this is not a corner plot. These examples are not therefore comparable in size, design or visual impact to the development before me, and they do not justify the harm that I have identified would be caused by the appeal proposal.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area. It would therefore conflict with Policy BE1 of the Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies 2012 and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the LPP2 which include requirements for good design, development that harmonises with local context, and subordinate extensions that do not adversely affect the character, appearance or quality of an area. It would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as it broadly seeks well-designed places and includes a requirement for development that is sympathetic to local character.

## **Conclusion**

9. The proposal would make effective use of the site to create additional living space for the appellant's family, but I do not consider that this benefit is sufficient to outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area and the resulting conflict with the development plan.
10. With the appeal, the appellant has provided copies of comments from neighbouring occupiers which I note indicate support for the application. However, these do not alter my conclusions on the planning merits of the appeal, nor offset the harm that I have found.
11. The proposal would conflict with the development plan when it is read as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate that the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*J Bowyer*

INSPECTOR