
Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 7 September 2021

by Gareth W Thomas BSc (Hons) MSc (Dist) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3275441

22 Cleveland Road, UXBRIDGE, UB8 2DR

- 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 Ms Rajini Shureshkumar against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 64779/APP/2021/1080, dated 18 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is First Floor Side Extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a detached inter-war two storey dwelling house of identical appearance to several other properties to the south, which enjoy similar linear plot arrangements as well as a consistent building style based on Edwardian suburban architecture. Immediately to the north is a two-storey dwelling of a more modern appearance.
4. The proposal would see the erection of a second storey extension over the existing recently constructed single storey side extension. Set back from the front building line, the extension would incorporate a hipped roof to match the style of the roof to the original house. However, in so doing, the extension would unacceptably close the gap that exists with the modern house immediately to the north.
5. Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part One Strategic Policies and Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020) requires amongst other things that new developments should be well-designed so that they enhance and contribute to the area in terms of form, scale and materials whilst respecting existing street patterns. Further, the policies seek to ensure that cumulative impact on character and appearance of the area is avoided.
6. Whilst efforts have been made to respect the architectural detailing of the host property, I find that the proposal would have an undesirable terracing effect, which would have a negative visual impact on the character and appearance of

the appeal property and the area more generally. I am also conscious of the undesirable precedent that would arise should this appeal be allowed. The street scene presently benefits enormously from the fact that none of the properties that lay to the south have been extended at second floor. The pleasant Edwardian style and plot arrangement of this inter-war housing has so far been maintained and its distinctive characterful appearance retained as a consequence.

7. The appeal proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property, which in turn would have an unacceptable and deleterious effect on the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, the proposal would be contrary to the Council's policies in this regard as explained above.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gareth W Thomas

INSPECTOR