



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 May 2021

by Rachael Pipkin BA (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/20/3265105
157-159 Dorchester Waye, Hayes UB4 0HZ

- 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 Sukhwinder Singh Walia and Mohinder PalSingh Sihra against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 10583/APP/2020/2585, dated 17 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'two houses first floor rear extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor rear extension at 157-159 Dorchester Waye, Hayes UB4 0HZ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 10583/APP/2020/2585, dated 17 August 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans: Unnumbered location plan, 20/3329/51, 20/3329/52, 20/3329/53, 20/3329/54, 20/3329/55 and 20/3329/56.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Procedural Matter

2. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the application form, the decision notice describes the proposal as a 'first floor extension'. I have used this simpler and more accurate description in my formal decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Numbers 157 and 159 (Nos 157 and 159) form a pair of semi-detached houses which have both been previously extended with two-storey side extensions and

single-storey rear extensions. The houses are located within a residential street of similar properties, some of which have been extended. At the rear, the properties face towards similar properties fronting Minterne Way.

5. Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies 2020 (LPP2) sets out that flat roofed two-storey extensions will not be acceptable unless the design is in keeping with the particular character of the existing house.
6. The proposed extension would be positioned at the rear above existing single-storey extensions and between existing two-storey rear additions to both properties. It would have a flat roof which would contrast with the pitched roofs of the host properties. However, since it would terminate at eaves level, it would not disrupt the roof form. Whilst it would increase the bulk of both properties, it would not extend beyond the rear building line and its flat roofed design, positioned between the two pitched roofs of the rear additions, would make it appear subordinate to the host properties. In addition, with both properties being extended in the same way, they would retain their symmetry. In this context, the extension would not unduly harm the character or appearance of the host properties.
7. As the extension would be entirely contained at the rear and between the existing first floor projections it would be visible from the rear of properties along Minterne Way but otherwise not visible from the public realm, with any views restricted to a glimpse through a gap between properties on Brookside Road. As such, it would not be prominent within the streetscene and its impact would be very limited.
8. I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character of the host property and the surrounding area. It would therefore comply with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies 2012 and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the LPP2. These policies together require new development to improve the quality of the built environment, to achieve a high quality of design that makes a positive contribution to the local area, appears subordinate to the main dwelling and is in keeping with the particular character of the existing house.

Conditions

9. The Council has suggested a number of conditions which I have considered against the tests set out in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework. A condition specifying the approved plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In the interests of character and appearance, I have imposed a condition requiring materials to match existing. In view of the limited size of the proposed extensions, a requirement to provide details and samples of materials is unnecessary.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

Rachael Pipkin

INSPECTOR