



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2020

by Rachel Walmsley BSc MSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3249253

23 Pynchester Close, Ickenham UB10 8JY

- 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 Gerard Lawlor against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon Council.
 - The application Ref 28658/APP/2019/3886, dated 2 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The proposed development would exceed half the width of the existing dwelling and therefore would appear unsympathetic to the scale of the original house. This would conflict directly with policy DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 which states that side extensions should be limited in width to less than half the width of the original property. The policy refers to all side extensions, irrespective of the form of the house and so policy DMHD1 is relevant to the development proposed. Whilst the set back of the extension from the front of the property and the sympathetic approach to architectural detailing and materials would create some degree of subservience, they would not mitigate the harm as a result of the width of the extension.
4. The form of development within Pynchester Close has changed over time as properties have been extended. However, gaps between buildings remain a feature of the street scene, creating a visual break between buildings and maintaining a sense of openness. The disproportionately large extension would appear overly dominant in the gap between the appeal site and the neighbouring property, No 21. In turn, the development would appear incongruous within the street and would be harmful to the sense of openness described.
5. Details of similar extensions in the area do not clarify how these developments came to be. Without evidence of the circumstances that led to their prominence, fair and reasonable comparisons cannot be made between the

development and these case studies. Based on the evidence before me I find nothing specific or substantive relating to these developments that compares closely with the appeal proposal for me to find that a precedent has been set in favour of the appeal. Notwithstanding this, each case must be decided on its own merits, according to the facts and circumstances pertaining to that case, and it is on this basis that I have decided the appeal.

6. No 18 Pynchester Close has been extended with a two-storey side extension. The development has retained a notable gap between this property and the neighbouring house, No 16, which maintains a sense of openness within the cul-de-sac. Undoubtedly the public footpath running parallel with the site and the wide plot frontage have assisted with this. The appeal site does not benefit from the same features and so the two sites cannot be compared favourably. All in all, I find no precedent that weights in favour of the appeal.
7. For the reasons given, the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would therefore be contrary to policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 and policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 which seek development that, amongst other matters, has no adverse impact on local character and the appearance of the street.

Other matters

8. The Council was correct to decide the planning application on policies that were in place at the time of its decision. I am required to and have done the same.
9. I note the lack of objection to the proposed development and the benefits of a lack of harm to neighbouring occupiers. However, these are not matters which justify allowing the development which I have found to be otherwise harmful.
10. It is not within the remit of this appeal to comment on the events that led the Council to its decision. Any grievances the appellant has in this regard should be directed to the Council.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the development would be contrary to the development plan. There are no material considerations to suggest a decision other than in accordance with the development plan and therefore the appeal is dismissed.

R Walmsley

INSPECTOR