



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2021 by C Glaister BSc (Hons)

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3278863

17 Boniface Road, Ickenham UB10 8BU

- 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 A Nathwani against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 12629/APP/2021/1144, dated 22 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first-floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. The Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 20 July 2021. Regard has been had to the revised national policy as a material consideration in the decision-making process. However, in this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. There is therefore no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The site is a corner plot house in a residential area. It adjoins The Mallows, a short cul-de-sac which accommodates a number of dwellings on its eastern side, as well as further dwellings to the west behind 17 Boniface Road. No 17 is a detached property with a ground-floor element on one side. This element is situated close to the fenced boundary of the site which immediately adjoins the pavement along The Mallows. The existing form of the building promotes a feeling of openness through to The Mallows from Boniface Road.
6. The first-floor side extension would develop the space above the existing ground-floor element. It would have a lower ridge height than the main

dwelling and extend to the full width of the existing ground-floor element. Due to the site's proximity to the Mallows, its corner position, and the width of the extension, the development would reduce the existing sense of openness, and confine the approach to The Mallows. It would be prominent and imposing and result in harm to the character and appearance of the area.

7. No 18 Eleanor Grove is also sited on a corner plot. There are similarities between the development at No 18 and the proposal. However, the distance maintained between the site and the adjoining pavement varies, and the layout of the area, including the form of the roads, is different. The appeal is considered with respect to its own individual merits.
8. For these reasons, the development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore fail to comply with Policy BE1 of the Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHD1 and DMHB 11 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (January 2020) which together seek to ensure: development makes a positive contribution to the local area in terms of layout, form, and scale; extensions to corner plots maintain the openness of the area; and that all development harmonises with the local context.

Other Matters

9. Careful consideration has been given to the appellant's family circumstances as they relate to health and ease of access to the property's facilities. However, these are personal circumstances which are likely to be able to be addressed by an alternative scheme. As such, these circumstances have limited weight and would not outweigh the harm that would arise from the development.
10. An absence of representations received during the consultation process is a neutral matter which does not weigh in support of the development. Although the site is not within a conservation area, the development must nonetheless accord with the development plan. Neither of these factors would mitigate the harm identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Glaister

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR