



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2025 by S Jamieson BA(Hons) MPlan

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/25/3360139

34 Rodmell Close, Hayes UB4 9RS

- 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 Anujan Theivendram against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 73415/APP/2024/2519.
 - The development proposed is single storey front and side extension to existing dwelling house with habitable rooms in roof and dormer to front and rear.
-

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. The planning application form refers to 'Mr & Mrs Anujan' as the applicants. However, it has been clarified during the appeal process that this was an error and that the application form should have stated that Mr Anujan Theivendram was the applicant. It has been confirmed that Mr Anujan Theivendram is also the appellant and the banner heading for this appeal decision therefore reflects this.
4. The Council's decision notice refers to '30 Britchford Road', in relation to the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. The Council also refers to 'Britchford', 'Britchfield' and 'Ditchfield' Road interchangeably in its report. Having reviewed the appeal evidence including the submitted Site Plans (Ref 2212/3), I understand the correct street name to be 'Ditchfield Road' and have used it throughout this recommendation.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - a) the character and appearance of the area; and
 - b) the living conditions of occupiers of 30 Ditchfield Road (No 30), with particular regard to privacy.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

6. The appeal dwelling is a detached bungalow, which occupies a corner plot on a residential street. The area has a suburban feel and is predominately characterised by two-storey detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings of traditional design. While building lines do vary, groups of dwellings in the area often sit on similar building lines to their immediate neighbours, and dwellings are mainly set back from the road by either private gardens or driveways. Dwellings on corner plots vary in their alignment but are generally set away from roadside boundaries, which creates a notable sense of space. The appeal dwelling is consistent with these characteristics.
7. The proposed front extension would not protrude beyond the existing front porch or the building line of the neighbouring property on Rodmell Close. However, the side extension would extend very close to the Ditchfield Road boundary and significantly forward of the front elevations of dwellings to this side of Ditchfield Road. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy DMHB 11 (Design of New Development) of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) (HLPP2) which requires extensions to harmonise with the local context in relation to, amongst other things, building lines and set backs.
8. Moreover, as a result of its scale and position, the extension would largely consume the space between the side elevation of the host dwelling and the pavement, which currently makes an important contribution to the spacious characteristics of the street. Again, this would be contrary to the HLPP2, with Policy DMHD 1 (Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings) requiring proposals for extensions to corner plots to maintain the openness of the area. Therefore, due to the prominent corner location and the scale and bulk of the side extension, the appeal proposal would appear as an incongruous and overly dominant addition to the property and would unacceptably erode the rhythm of built form and the sense of openness on Ditchfield Road.
9. I have been supplied with evidence from the appellant of local examples that they feel are similar to the proposed development. Whilst I acknowledge that building lines in the surrounding area are not uniform, the relative alignment of the appeal proposal to the nearest neighbouring properties on Ditchfield Road, and its position very close to the roadside boundary in this instance, would not positively respond to the appeal site's immediate surroundings. Even if there is variation in roof form in the area, this does not overcome the harmful effect resulting from the scale and siting of the proposal close to the roadside boundary on Ditchfield Road. Furthermore, the existing boundary fence on the appeal site is not comparable to the height of the extension, nor would it effectively assimilate the bulk of the proposal into the street scene.
10. I conclude, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Thus, it would conflict with the design objectives of Policy D3 (Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach) of The London Plan (2021), Policy BE1 (Built Environment) of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 – Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the HLPP2 which, amongst other things, require residential extensions to be of an appropriate scale, to enhance local distinctiveness and to make a positive contribution to the local

area. The proposal would also conflict with the requirements in the Framework for good design and for developments to be sympathetic to local character.

Living conditions

11. The back garden of the appeal site is modest in depth, and the proposed rear dormer would afford close up, direct views into the private garden of No 30, leading to a loss of privacy for these occupiers. However, the appellant has indicated they would be agreeable to a condition to mitigate the potential of overlooking, by means of obscure glazing. Whilst it may not always be appropriate for the window of a habitable room to be obscure glazed, the bedroom which this window serves would be dual-aspect and the additional front dormer would ensure acceptable outlook would be provided from this room for occupiers of the host property. I therefore agree with the appellant that provided that the rear dormer window were to be obscure glazed, and that any such condition also required the window to be fixed shut to a specified height above internal floor level, this would ensure the privacy of the occupiers of No 30 would be maintained.
12. I am satisfied therefore that the proposed development would, subject to an appropriate condition, have an acceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 30. In this regard, the proposal could comply with the relevant sections of Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the HLPP2, which permit house extensions where a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved and where they would not adversely impact on the amenity of adjacent properties.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. I have found that the proposal, subject to an appropriate condition, would not have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 30. However, for the reasons set out above, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and in this respect would conflict with the development plan. Therefore, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Jamieson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

M Russell

INSPECTOR