

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/23/3317015

2 Ebury Close, Northwood, Hillingdon, HA6 2PF

- 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 Ameet Ramaiya against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 36204/APP/2022/2805, dated 9 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is a double storey rear extension. Double storey side extension to right of property. Double storey front extension. Roof configurations with two small dormers at the rear. New canopy at the entrance.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Planning permission¹ was previously granted for a part single storey part two storey rear extension, two storey front extension, single storey side extension and conversion of roof space to habitable accommodation and provision of 2no rear facing dormers. The proposal the subject of this appeal would effectively add an extension to the proposal already permitted. The proposal the subject of this appeal is, effectively, for a larger development than that granted by this previous permission.
3. One of the Council's reasons for refusal related to arboricultural matters which I consider have been addressed by relevant information submitted by the appellant.
4. Another of the Council's reasons for refusal related to the privacy of neighbouring occupiers. However, the appellant has confirmed that he would accept the imposition of a condition aimed at preventing any overlooking from the proposed rear-facing balcony and I consider that such a condition would serve to prevent any significant harm arising in respect of the living conditions of neighbours, having regard to privacy.
5. Taking the above into account, I consider the main issue in this case to be that set out below.

¹ Reference: 36204/APP/2021/4330.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

7. The appeal property is a detached dwelling located towards the end of a small cul-de-sac in a residential area. Dwellings in Ebury Close comprise brick and tile detached dwellings set around a turning area, set back from the road behind front gardens and with larger gardens to the rear.
8. The presence of gardens and woodland provides for a spacious, green and leafy character.
9. During my site visit I observed that whilst many dwellings in the area appear to have been altered and/or extended, such changes tend to appear in keeping with the original character of host properties and with the surrounding area.
10. The proposed development would involve the considerable extension of the dwelling, including the creation of a large crown roof towards the rear, which would rise above the height of the existing main roof, resulting in an unduly awkward appearance. Further, the height and scale of the proposed roof would result in it appearing unduly prominently in its surroundings and as such, I find that it would draw attention to itself as an incongruous feature.
11. The harm arising as a result of the above would be exacerbated as a result of the disproportionately large extension to the rear of the dwelling, whereby the combination of the proposed roof and considerable projection to the rear at a two-storey height would result in the proposal failing to appear subordinate to, but rather, overwhelming and subsuming the original appearance of the host dwelling.
12. Further to the above, additional harm would arise as a result of the proposed front canopy appearing as a tall, bulky and prominently located forward-projection which, in combination with the proposed rear extension and roof, would add to the proposal's failure to appear subordinate to the host dwelling and would result in a development of such overall scale as to erode the spacious attributes of the area.
13. Consequently, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to London Plan Policy D3; to Local Plan² Policy BE1; and to Development Management³ Policies DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Conclusion

14. 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).