The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2019

by Karen Taylor MSC URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3230305
14A Wilstone Close, Hayes UB4 9RL

- 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 Mustapha Omar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 71592/APP/2019/619, dated 21 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 April 2019.
- The development proposed is the erection of single storey side/rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of single storey side/rear extension at 14A Wilstone Close, Hayes UB4 9RL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 71592/APP/2019/619, dated 21 February 2019, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:

    1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

    2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: INF-132-03 Rev.04 and INF-132-04 Rev.06.

    3) The external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of development from the Council's decision notice as this more accurately describes the appeal proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons

4. Wilstone Close is a residential street forming part of a wider estate characterised by a mix of two storey houses, many of these have been extended in some form but the majority of dwellings have individual characteristics. The appeal property is positioned at the end of a cul-de-sac and

is set back considerably from the road within a substantial plot. Although the property has been extended previously the proposed extension would add a modest single storey addition to the side adjoining the rear elevation of good design. It would be of a relatively narrow appearance in comparison to the existing frontage and have a mono pitch roof.

5. Moreover, the building line to the front of the property is staggered and the fact that the extension would be set back from the forwardmost part of the dwelling will help to reduce its apparent impact. The proposed roof form limits its height, materials would match, and the narrow width appearance would not be bulky or of an excessive scale and it would appear subservient to the host property. For those reasons the cumulative effects of this modest addition would not cause undue harm to the appearance of the dwelling. I have also taken the approach that even if I were to take the Council's position that the extension would exceed half the width of the original property, given the scale of the building overall, relationship and layout with No 14, and the relatively discrete location of the frontage in the street scene, this addition would not undermine the principles set out in the supplementary planning guidance (SPG), HDAS: Residential Extensions.

6. The position of the property at the end of the cul-de-sac results in limited views of the side elevation from along Wilstone close. The existing side fence would screen the development from Byron Way and the tower block, furthermore the rear of the site is enclosed with limited views. As such the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the immediate and wider area.

7. I conclude that the single storey extension would respect the character and appearance of the host property and the area in general. It would accord with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Saved Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (1998). These policies collectively seek to achieve a high quality of design which complements or improves the character of the area, it would also accord with the SPG, HDAS: Residential Extensions.

Conditions

8. A condition specifying the time limit and approved plans is necessary as this provides certainty. I have imposed a condition specifying materials are to match the existing building in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

9. I have considered the Council's concern about the potential for future sub-division of the property and note comments about past breaches of planning control. However, I must deal with the proposal on its merits on the basis of what is proposed which is a single storey extension. Concerns about what could occur in future do not amount to a reason to attach a planning condition in relation to the development currently proposed. Planning permission would be required to sub-divide the property and use part of it independently of the existing house. If such development occurred without the necessary planning permission the Council would be able to consider taking enforcement action at that point in time.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Karen Taylor

INSPECTOR