

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2020

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3240321

100 Glencoe Road, Hayes UB4 9SN

- 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 V Nayak against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 74951/APP/2019/2318, dated 9 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a 2 storey side and part single storey rear extension to the dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 2 storey side and part single storey rear extension to the dwellinghouse at 100 Glencoe Road, Hayes UB4 9SN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 74951/APP/2019/2318, dated 9 July 2019, 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: 01A and 02A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the Council refused planning permission it has adopted the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies 2020 (P2LP). As a result, the Policies within that document carry full weight and they have replaced the Local Plan Part 2 Saved UDP Policies (2012), which are no longer in force. The Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Extensions 2008 has also been withdrawn.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling forms part of a terrace of dwellings, and is one of three dwellings making up the terrace that share a consistent design and scale. Their

general character and appearance is typical of the other dwellings that are located on what is a substantially sized housing estate. The appeal site is positioned on a bend in Glencoe Road and this means that the appeal dwelling is prominently located within the street scene.

5. The proposed extension has been designed to replicate the features of the existing dwellings in the row, including their fenestration and dormer windows. Its width in particular allows these features to be incorporated in a manner that would be sympathetic to the design of the existing terrace, including in terms of the positioning and spacing of the windows. Whilst Policy DMHD 1 of the P2LP sets out a requirement for side extensions to be subordinate and no more than half the width of the original dwelling, the proposal in its current form would be appropriate in its design and scale and in its relationship to the appeal dwelling and the terrace in which it sits.
6. For these reasons, I conclude that the development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, the terrace of dwellings or to the surrounding area. Consequently, there would be no conflict with the objectives of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies 2012 which seeks to safeguard character and appearance. Whilst there is some conflict with the specific design criteria of Policy DMHD 1 of the P2LP, I have identified reasons why the circumstances of the proposal before me outweighs such conflict and why this conflict would not result in harm in this instance.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal, subject to conditions, should be allowed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR