



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 April 2025 by E Nutman BA (Hons)

### Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 August 2025

#### Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3358043

#### 107 Woodlands Avenue, Ruislip HA4 9RB

- 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 Mulchandani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref is 52182/APP/2024/2207.
- The proposal is a two storey side extension.

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

### Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

#### *Character and Appearance*

4. 107 Woodlands Avenue (No 107) is a semi-detached dwelling located on a corner plot where Woodlands Avenue intersects with Warren Drive. The properties within the surrounding area are predominantly semi-detached and there is often much symmetry between pairs. There is variation in design in the area including in terms of materials and in some cases where dwellings have been extended. Indeed, the existing side extension at No 107 introduces some imbalance relative to its adjoining counterpart at 105 Woodlands Avenue (No 105). Nevertheless, although the host dwelling projects forward of the return building line on Warren Drive, its setback from the side boundary prevents the built form from appearing overly dominant. This maintains a suitably spacious character at the corner, which positively contributes to the street scene.
5. The proposal would conflict with several specific requirements of Policy DMHD 1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) (DMP). Firstly, the cumulative extensions would substantially exceed half the width of the original dwelling. Due to the extension's two-storey scale and even with the use of matching materials and the replication of the fenestration pattern, this would give the host dwelling a markedly elongated appearance, emphasising the disparity in width between the host dwelling and its

counterpart at No 105. This would be further exacerbated by the absence of a reduction in ridge height or, as required by DMHD 1, a set back from the main front elevation.

6. Furthermore, the extension would significantly exceed the return building line on Warren Drive and, even accounting for the tapered alignment of the side boundary, would only incorporate a narrow gap to the boundary. This would unacceptably diminish the sense of openness at the corner, appearing unduly dominant and cramped, compounding the conflict with the requirements of Policy DMHD 1.
7. I accept that whether or not an extension should appear subordinate is typically assessed against the site-specific context in any particular case. However, the side extension at 109 Woodlands Avenue, whilst adjacent to the boundary with Warren Road, is single storey. This means that it does not have a dominant presence on the corner and so is not comparable to the two-storey appeal proposal. The locations of the side extensions in Figure 3 within the appellant's statement are unclear. Moreover, the examples provided are limited in number and do not indicate that elongated two-storey extensions, positioned close to the side boundaries of corner plots, form part of the prevailing character in the vicinity of the appeal site.
8. I conclude, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. In that regard, it would conflict with Policies D3 and D4 of The London Plan (2021), Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the DMP which seek high quality design, require that the form and layout of a development enhance and harmonise with local context, that there is no adverse cumulative impact of development proposals on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area and set out specific requirements in terms of two-storey side extensions, including in respect of dwellings on corner plots.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

*E Nutman*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

*M Russell*

INSPECTOR