
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 November 2020

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 25 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3253061

31 Manor Road, Hayes UB3 2DG

- 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 Bhajan Lal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 954/APP/2020/430, dated 9 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as the "demolition of existing rear conservatory and existing side extension; erection of a double rear and double side extension wraparound."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. No 31 Manor Road sits at the end of a terrace of 4 houses, immediately adjacent to the junction of Manor Road with Addison Way. The 2 storey house is modest in size and a number of the terraces here have the end houses set forward of the middle 2, and having a gable end facing the front; acting as 'book-ends', as described by the Council.
4. The side boundary of the plot is immediately adjacent to the pavement on Addison Way and on the opposite side of that road is a grassed area of public open space containing trees and a small play area. The side and rear of the property are readily visible within the street-scene.
5. The appellant has acknowledged that the proposal would represent an additional width of two-thirds of the original house and that it would more than double its footprint. The Council's recently adopted 'Local Plan Part 2, Development Management Policies' (adopted 16 January 2020) (DMP), includes Policy DMHD 1 which sets out detailed requirements for household extensions. These include that side extensions should not be more than half the width of the original house, side extensions at corners should maintain openness and that side extensions should be set a minimum of 1m from the

side boundary, as well as the more general requirement that extensions should be subordinate to the original house.

6. The proposal would clearly conflict with the requirements of Policy DMHD 1 in relation to its width. In relation to the proximity to the side boundary, the requirement for a 1m gap would be breached but the appellant indicates that this requirement is to maintain a suitable gap between properties and, as this is an end property, this does not apply. This would appear to be the case, but the policy also requires that side extensions at corner plots should maintain openness. In this respect, I consider that the proposed extension of around two thirds the width of the house, close to the boundary and of a significant depth would have an adverse effect on openness.
7. The appellant has pointed out other extensions within the area that, in some respects, are similar to the proposal and I have seen these at my site visit. None of them would appear as prominent and at a corner plot such as the appeal site. In addition, given the recent adoption of the DMP, it is very unlikely that any of these extensions were considered under these now relevant policies.
8. In conclusion, I consider that the proposal would appear unacceptably prominent at this corner location and would give rise to a loss of openness. The size of the proposed extension would also dominate the original house and would fail to be subordinate to it. In these respects, the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the provisions of Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the DMP. I have taken account of all other matters referred to in the submissions but find nothing sufficient to outweigh the conflict that I have identified. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR