



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 13 October 2020

by Rachel Walmsley MSc, MA, BSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3251752
40 Rectory Way, Ickenham, UB10 8BS

- 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 & Mrs Vishal Thakrar against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 26870/APP/2019/4064, dated 17 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of attached existing garage and carport. New single storey rear extension 4m deep x 9.218m wide. New two storey side extension 3.178m wide x 10.796m deep. New tiled roof to ground floor front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The appeal site is also subject to appeal ref APP/R5510/D/20/3252384.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Houses in Rectory Way are modest in size. Extensions and alterations are mostly ancillary in form and scale to the main dwelling. Car ports and parking areas to the side of houses add visual interest and maintain space between properties. In all, Rectory Way exhibits a pleasing residential character.
5. The 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.
6. Some allowance can be made for the fact that the development would be just over half the width of the existing house. Nevertheless, the development would not be set back from the front building line of the host dwelling and the roof canopy at ground floor level would emphasise the undue width of the property. These matters combined would result in a proposal that would

- appear overly dominant in relation to the form and scale of the existing house and unduly large and overbearing in the street scene.
7. No 36 Rectory Way has an extended front canopy, but it does not extend across the full width of the house. Furthermore, the property has not been extended with a two-storey side extension. It does not, therefore, compare favourably with the appeal proposal.
 8. The loss of the car port and the lack of space to the side of the property for parking would add to the overall bulk and mass of the development. No's 38 and 50 Rectory Way have car ports which provide some visual interest at ground floor level. This does not compare with the development proposed and therefore these examples do not set a precedent in favour of the appeal.
 9. The two-storey extension at No 52 Rectory Way has not been set back from the front elevation of the host dwelling. However, the form of this property differs from the appeal property, not least because of a car port and ground floor gable. The form and scale of No 52, therefore, differs noticeably from the appeal proposal and therefore fair and reasonable comparisons cannot be made between the two. Notwithstanding these comparisons, 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.
 10. The sympathetic approach to detailing and materials, the set-down of the proposed ridge line, the gap to the side boundary and the retention of the gable at first floor would help create some subservience and ensure that the property had some visual connection with houses in the street. In addition, the single storey rear extension would complement the scale and architectural style of the existing house. However, these matters would not overcome the harm that I have found relating to the form and scale of the two-storey side extension.
 11. The development may create a more functional and spacious home but there is nothing in the evidence before me to suggest that the amount of accommodation proposed is what's needed for the number of people residing at the property. Furthermore, there is no evidence of the proposed development being the optimum solution.
 12. All in all, the development would appear unduly large and overly dominant in the street and so would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and 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.

Conclusion

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

R Walmsley

INSPECTOR