

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 May 2023

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3311953

1 Dale Close, Pinner, Hillingdon, HA5 3UU

- 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 Jigar Shah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 3601/APP/2022/2242, dated 12 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is a front extension to create more bedroom space and roof coverage at the entrance to already permitted planning permission (3601/APP/2022/324).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development refers to a recent planning permission¹ and the proposal the subject of this appeal would effectively add an extension to the proposal already permitted.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a white rendered semi-detached bungalow situated close to a prominent corner where Dale Close meets Alandale Drive.
5. The appeal property is located in a residential area characterised by the presence of detached and semi-detached bungalows and two storey dwellings, set back from the street behind gardens and/or driveways and with longer gardens to the rear.
6. The presence of gardens, a grass verge and street trees provides for a sense of spaciousness and greenery and also, during my site visit, I observed that similarities between pairs of dwellings and common design features, including

¹ Reference: 3601/APP/2022/324.

the use of white render and black Tudor-style boards and the common presence of similar tiled roofs, provides for an attractive sense of uniformity.

7. Also during my site visit, I observed that whilst many dwellings have been altered and/or extended, such changes tend to appear in keeping with the original character of host properties and the surrounding area.
8. The proposed development would create an enlarged extension towards the front of the property with a roof canopy porch. When combined with the approved extension, I find that this would result in the creation of an awkward addition that would jar with and appear disproportionate to the appearance of the approved extension. It would result in an overall extension that would appear incongruous against and fail to appear subordinate to, the host dwelling.
9. The harm arising as a result of the above would be exacerbated as a result of the prominent location of the appeal property, whereby an awkward and disproportionate addition to the front of the dwelling would draw attention to itself as a widely visible incongruous feature.
10. Consequently, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, to Local Plan² Policy BE1 and to Development Management³ Policies DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

11. The appellant, in support of the proposal, draws attention to other developments elsewhere. However, the circumstances relating to each of these developments do not appear to be so similar to those relating 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

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

N McGurk

INSPECTOR

² Reference: Hillingdon Local Plan Part One – Strategic Policies (2012).

³ Reference: Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020).