



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2021

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3280879

105 Great Central Avenue, Ruislip HA4 6TU

- 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 Tossel against the decision of The London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 55304/APP/2021/1822, dated 4 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is Single Storey Wrap Around Extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey end of row house within a short block of houses, and is the last dwelling along this side of Great Central Avenue. The character of the area is residential, made up from a mixture of bungalows and houses although the blocks of houses on this side share similar characteristics.
4. The appeal property benefits from a large side garden and the main entrance door is positioned on the side elevation. This would be relocated to the front elevation and would retain the symmetry with other houses seen within close range.
5. The side extension would appear as an uncharacteristically wide extension when viewed from the front elevation, in relation to the host dwelling. Its excessive width would appear out of proportion with the host dwelling. Even with the use of matching materials and fenestration detail, it would not harmonise with the host dwelling or appear as a subordinate addition. Thus, it would appear detrimentally harmful to the host dwelling and to the character and appearance of the local area to which it is visually experienced.
6. There may be new houses built in spaces between dwellings, however that is not the same circumstances as the proposal before me. Further, the appellant has brought to my attention another appeal decision. However, this relates to a different street and is for a two storey extension and includes a first floor set

back. Even if it extends more than half the width of the dwelling, it is not directly comparable to the proposal before me. In any case, each application is considered on its own individual merits.

7. Irrespective of no objections received to the proposal from neighbouring residents or that it would lead to no harm arising to highway safety, these are neutral matters that neither weighs for or against the proposal.
8. It has been brought to my attention by the appellant that the proposal is required due to their specific medical needs. However, no details of such have been forthcoming to allow me to consider this further.
9. As I have found the proposed extension would result in harm arising to the character and appearance of the local area, it would thus conflict with the objectives of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies 2012 and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies 2020 in their combined design aims.

Conclusion

10. Due to its harmful effect on the character and appearance of the local area, as the proposal would lead to conflict with the development plan taken as a whole, there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR