



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 December 2021

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3281801
31 Glebe Road, Hayes UB3 2EB

- 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 D S Khurana against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 75934/APP/2021/1737, dated 28 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is 2 storey side extension with alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 2 storey side extension with alterations to fenestration at 31 Glebe Road Hayes in accordance with the terms of application, Ref 75934/APP/2021/1737, dated 28 April 2021, 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: Site location plan, Existing elevations, Existing ground floor, first floor and block plans, Proposed Elevations and Proposed ground floor, first floor and block plans.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey dwelling located within a densely built up residential area and is the end dwelling of a short row of houses. The local area is characterised by similar house types and pattern of development.
4. The proposal would be set back at first floor to the front elevation with the ridge line lower than the host dwelling and matching fenestration pattern. Together with its proposed width, it would appear as a subordinate extension to the host dwelling. The use of matching materials and fenestration pattern

would successfully blend with the host dwelling and appear as a sympathetic form of development within the street scene.

5. There are other examples of similar extensions along the same road and within close range to the appeal site. Even if these extensions have been approved under different Council policy requirements, that is not to say that there are no other considerations to take into account when assessing the proposal, especially given there are local examples of similar developments. The proposal would not lead to harm arising to the character and appearance of the area.
6. To conclude on this main issue, the development would harmonise with the host dwelling and would not harm the character and appearance of the local area. It would thus accord with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan 2021 and the National Planning Policy Framework in their combined aims to provide well designed places of quality.

Conditions

7. I have considered conditions in light of the Planning Practice Guidance and Paragraph 56 of the Framework. In addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition relating to the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty, and a condition in relation to matching materials is reasonable in order to protect the character and appearance of the local area.

Conclusion

8. Taking into account the information before me, I have reached a conclusion in favour of the development. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR