



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2024

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3336987

42 Halford Road, Ickenham, Hillingdon, UB10 8PZ

- 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 Chiraag against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 21435/APP/2023/3152, dated 31 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 27 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is front infill extension, 2m rear extension and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. I consider that the main issues in this case are its effect on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of residents.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. 42 Halford Road is a detached bungalow with two large flat roofed side dormers, located in an established residential area. The street scene is characterised by detached bungalows set back from the road. They are of varying designs and many have prominent gables to the front elevations which appear as a consistent feature along the street.
4. The relevant policies in this case include policies BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (November 2012) and DMHB11 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (January 2020) (the local plan) and D3 of the London Plan. These relate to the design of new development, including extensions, which should harmonise with the local environment, respect the design of the original house and protect the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers.
5. I consider that the design, size and siting of the proposed extension would appear incongruous and out of keeping with the existing building itself and the wider street scene. Although it would be subservient to the building, the front element extending across from the projecting gable to wrap around to the existing side extension with its pitched/crown roof would appear as an awkward

addition in the context of the clean lines of the main architectural style of the building. The latter is already compromised by the existing large side dormers and the cumulative effect of the proposal and the dormers would result in a number of poorly integrated features which would detract from the character and appearance of the host building as a whole.

6. Many properties nearby have been extended and altered in a variety of ways but the prominent front gables remain as a highly visible feature along the street. There are a few examples of pitched roof front extensions/canopies across front elevations nearby, but I consider that these do not relate well to the original form of the host buildings and do not make a positive contribution to the street scene. They do not weigh in favour of this appeal.
7. I conclude that the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the existing building and the wider street scene, contrary to policies BE1, DMHB11 and DMHD1 of the local plan and D3 of the London Plan.

Living conditions

8. The property has previously had a full height rear extension and the proposal would include an additional full width single storey extension to the rear. The neighbouring property, No. 40 to the east is on a staggered building line with No. 42, such that the rear part of the latter, as extended, would project approximately 10m beyond the rear elevation of No. 40. The latter is located very close to the common boundary and has a relatively small garden and a somewhat restricted outlook. I consider that the extension of the proposed rear element into the garden of approximately 2m would result in an adverse impact on the outlook from that property, in that it would cause some increase in the sense of enclosure in the latter and some additional loss of afternoon sunlight. However, I consider that although the impact of this on the occupiers of No. 40 would not be sufficient on its own to dismiss the appeal it adds some weight against it.
9. The rear building line of No. 44 to the west is set back from that of No.42 such that the proposal would result in an overall projection of approximately 4.5m beyond the rear elevation of No. 44. I understand that the nearest rear facing windows in No. 44 to the boundary include a utility room and the kitchen. There would be some loss of outlook and sunlight from No. 44, but this would not be sufficient on its own to dismiss the appeal.
10. I conclude that the proposal would result in some harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents and that in this respect it would be inconsistent with policies DMHB11 and DMHD1.
11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR