



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2022

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3297498

8 Darris Close, Hayes UB4 9RX

- 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 D Farrell against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 63394/APP/2022/459, dated 14 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) (LP1), Policies DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) (LP2) and Policies D4 and D8 of the London Plan (2021), amongst other matters require that new development is of a high quality of design and in keeping with the character and local distinctiveness of the area.
4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling with open space to the front and rear of the property, the dwelling is situated in very close proximity to the neighbouring properties to either side, as is the situation elsewhere on Darris Close.
5. The appeal scheme consists of a small single storey side extension, shown on the submitted plans as being set back approximately 1 from the front elevation of the property but entirely filling the narrow space to the neighbouring property on the common boundary. The set back would reduce the prominence of the side extension but passing road users and pedestrians would still see the extension and what amounts to the conjoining of the properties.
6. I saw at the site visit that the gaps between the properties, while narrow, are nonetheless a distinct characteristic of the area and it is my planning judgement that the loss of this separation space between the dwellings would harm the character and appearance of the area. Thus the appeal scheme is

contrary to Policy BE1 of LP1, Policies DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1 of the LP2 and Policies D4 and D8 of the London Plan.

Other Matters

7. The appellant details that an extension was present in this location for some time before being demolished. Based on the evidence before me it is not clear whether or not this extension benefited from planning permission and given that it has subsequently been removed, the existing of this earlier extension does not outweigh the harm I have identified previously.

Conclusion

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

Mr M Brooker

INSPECTOR