



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 March 2025

by D Wilson BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/24/3350018

84 East Road, Hillingdon, West Drayton UB7 9HA

- 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 J Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref is 31005/APP/2024/1086.
- The development proposed is construction of two storey attached dwelling on land at no. 84 East Road.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site forms part a large rear garden for a two-storey end of terrace dwelling. The wider area is residential with many of the dwellings being terraced or semi-detached with a similar style. The site is located near a bend in the road and the large rear garden forms a spacious gap between the next property. These gaps are a notable characteristic in the wider residential area and break up the mass of the otherwise dense built form.
4. The proposed dwelling would be attached to No 84 and occupy almost the entirety of the remaining width of the plot, leaving a small gap between the neighbouring property which would be used as the access to the rear garden of the proposed dwelling.
5. The proposal would match the building line and height of the existing dwelling and would therefore appear as an obvious addition to the row of terraced houses. The proposal would close a substantial portion of the existing spacious gap and result in a property that would appear cramped at the end of the existing row of terraced properties, particularly due to the very small gap that would barely be visible at ground floor level due the proposals proximity to the existing extension at No 86.

6. I note that the density of the proposed dwelling would not conflict with Policy DMHB17 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies Adopted Version 16 January 2020 (LP), which is also not something the Council suggest conflict with. However, the size of the appeal site is large but due to the corner position and relationship with the neighbouring property the front of the site is narrow. The proposed dwelling would occupy most of the width of the frontage and therefore despite the density, would nonetheless appear visually cramped within the street scene.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the a Vision for 2026 Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies (Adopted November 2012), Policies DMH6, DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHB 14 of the LP, Policies D3, D4, D6 and D8 of the London Plan 2021 and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Amongst other things, these seek to ensure that development enhances the local distinctiveness of the area, protect features of positive value, be well integrated and maintain a strong sense of place.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has referred to several developments in an attempt to justify the appeal proposal. I do not have the full details in respect of such examples so I cannot be sure of the circumstances. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits, based on the evidence before me.
9. In respect of 22 Chestnut Close and the associated appeal decision¹, the location of the development differs through its corner position nearby a junction, and it was also found that gaps were not characteristic of the area which differs from the character and appearance of the appeal site before me.
10. In regard to 123 Central Avenue and the associated appeal decisions², the location of the development differs through its corner position nearby a junction. The character of the area also differs as it is described as spacious and uniform through wide pavements and set back from the street. The appeal site is not located in an area that has a spacious character, instead properties are close to the road and the spacious gap at the appeal site breaks up the otherwise dense built form.
11. In respect of 156 York Avenue and the associated appeal decision³, the spacious characteristics are defined by open grassed corners of junctions which differs from the spacious gaps between properties such as the appeal site.
12. In relation to 24 Wheatley Crescent, the Council found that while gaps between properties were characteristic of the area, that the remaining gap of over a metre would be appropriate for the site and surrounding area which differs from the appeal before me.

¹ APP/R5510/W/21/3269311

² APP/R5510/W/21/3270975 and APP/R5510/W/21/3278335

³ APP/R5510/W/20/3266175

13. The proposed development would result in the creation of a new dwelling which attracts some weight in favour of the appeal, albeit this is tempered by the small scale and partial loss of a garden. Therefore, this does not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area that I have identified.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

D Wilson

INSPECTOR