



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 December 2020

by Steven Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3258672

26 Gledwood Crescent, Hayes UB4 0AX

- 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 Amrik Singh against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 24599/APP/2020/1536, dated 18 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a first-floor side extension and conversion of an existing garage into a habitable room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning approval is granted for a first floor side/rear extension and conversion of an existing garage to a habitable room at 26 Gledwood Crescent, Hayes UB4 0AX in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 24599/APP/2020/1536, dated 18 May 2020, and subject to the following conditions:
 - i) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - ii) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following documents and plans:
VD091/PL01; VD091/PL02; VD091/PL03; VD091/PL04; VD091/PL05;
VD091/PL06; VD091/PL07; VD091/PL08.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant describes the proposed development as a first-floor side extension and conversion of an existing garage into a habitable room. The Local Planning Authority (LPA) describes it as a first-floor side/rear extension and conversion of garage to a habitable room. I have determined the appeal on the basis of the LPA description which more accurately describes the proposed development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the dwelling and upon the street scene.

Character and appearance

4. Gledwood Crescent is a residential area of two storey semi-detached dwellings, mainly with double pitched tiled roofs. Front amenity areas are mainly hard surfaced and given over to off-street parking. The dwellings are arranged with common building lines and most have small front porches. Several share paths between the houses leading to their rear amenity spaces and it is common for the dwellings abutting the private accesses to be two storeys in height. Such accesses vary in width, but several are approximately 1 metre wide.
5. The appeal property is a semi-detached, two storey dwelling with a paved front amenity space. It has a front extension canopy which encompasses the front entrance, and which also includes a single storey side extension. The side extension abuts a common access with number 24 Gledwood Crescent and which leads to their rear amenity spaces.
6. 24 Gledwood Crescent also has a single storey front/ side extension with a pitched roof and which also abuts the common, private access.
7. The gap between numbers 26 and 24 Gledwood Crescent is somewhat wider than is the norm for properties along the Crescent and is wider than that between the neighbouring semi-detached house to the appeal property and its neighbour in turn.
8. Whilst the proposed development would reduce the distance between the properties above first floor level, it would not do so more than is the case with several other instances in the immediate area. On my site visit, I was able to see that such other instances, by the sizes of the properties and the distances between them, do not appear cramped, both in relation to the individual properties or that of the street scene as a whole, and for this reason I find that the proposed development would not be detrimental to the character or appearance of the dwellinghouse or to that of the street scene.
9. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would accord with policies BE1, DMHB11 and DMHB12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One- Strategic Policies (2012) (HLP) which are concerned to ensure high quality design reflecting local character and appearance.
10. I appreciate that there is some conflict with policy DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (Development Management Policies) 2020) (HDMP) concerning house extensions in that side extensions should be set in by a minimum of 1 metre from a side boundary, whereas the proposed distance would be approximately 0.75 of a metre. However, the property already has a single storey side extension which is at the same distance from the side boundary, and also the immediate area is characterised by gaps of a similar size. Therefore, in this instance, I conclude that the aforementioned material planning considerations justify a departure from the technical requirement of policy DMHD1.

Conditions

11. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three-year time limit condition.
12. Otherwise than as set out in this decision and conditions, it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. I have therefore imposed a condition to this effect.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Steven Hartley

INSPECTOR