



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5th September 2023

by **Megan Thomas K.C. Barrister-at-Law**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3324073

15 Lynhurst Crescent, Uxbridge UB10 9EF

- 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 Saad Awan against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref.17612/APP/2023/323, dated 2 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 27 March 2023.
- The development is a first floor side extension with a column at the rear side.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The development sought has already taken place and the planning application is retrospective. I have not determined it any differently than if it were a prospective application.
3. The description of development in the heading above is a shortened one similar to the Decision Notice description. For completeness, the Appellant's application form described the development as *"It is a semidetached house where the proposed work has already been started but not completed. The proposed is side first floor extension on the top of existing side extension with part help of structural column at rearside. The proposal is to have an additional room to the property to be used by the same family as their requirement."*

Main Issue

4. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the streetscene.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises an end-of-terrace two storey dwelling located on the north side of Lynhurst Crescent, some 60 metres northwest of the junction with Oakleigh Road. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in terms of both built form and land use. There is an expanse of open space including a woodland to the north of the appeal site.

6. The appeal site is the eastern end of a row of six terraced houses and has a hipped roof. To its east is another row of six terraced houses, the nearest of which has a hipped roof. There is a modest gap separating the two blocks. A porch has been constructed at the front of the house and is not shown on the submitted plans. It is not part of the appeal before me.
7. The development sought is a first floor extension built on the top of a side extension. It has a flat roof and projects forward of the front elevation of the main house. The flat roof is broadly similar in height to the eaves level of the main house. The front porch has been built straddling the main front elevation and encroaching partly in front of the front of the side elevation. At the rear, the first floor side extension has a void underneath it, which is supported by a corner pillar. The rear wall of the first floor side extension is flush with the main rear elevation of the house. There is a single storey rear extension and a narrow rear garden with an outbuilding.
8. The first floor side extension jars significantly with both the character and visual appearance of the main dwelling harming architectural integrity. Its flat roof profile is significantly at odds visually with the hipped roof of the main dwelling. Its projection forward of the front elevation of the main house is also awkward and gives rise to a dominant structure. This appearance is not ameliorated or significantly screened by the construction of a porch at the front of the property which has taken place.
9. The first floor extension also visually closes the gap between the appeal site and no.17 Lynhurst Crescent. It does not step in from the ground floor side extension at the appeal site and, even though there is a partial void at ground floor level, the overall appearance is dominant, cramped and overbearing. The resulting development is not subordinate to the host dwelling and increases a terracing effect with no.17, notwithstanding that there is a slight difference in orientation between the two blocks of terraces.
10. Not all extensions in the immediate area are sympathetic to the area's character but nevertheless the first floor side extension at the appeal site looks notably out of keeping with other local dwellings. The eye is drawn to its unattractive box-like and blocky outline which is out of rhythm with other dwellings. The streetscene is further harmed by the loss of views at first floor level through to the verdant vegetated area beyond the rear of the appeal site.
11. Consequently, I conclude that the development significantly harms the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the streetscene. It conflicts with policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies (adopted January 2020).

Conclusion

12. Having taken into account all representations made including those of the Appellant, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.
INSPECTOR