The Planning Inspectorate

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 April 2022

**by Alison Scott (BA Hons) Dip TP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 6 May 2022**

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3291318**
**29 Hyde Way, Hayes, UB3 4PB**

- 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 Balbir Rai against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 39188/APP/2021/3880, dated 5 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2021.
- The development proposed is first floor side extension.

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene and the living conditions of the existing occupants.

## Reasons

*Character and appearance*

3. The appeal property lies within a planned housing development within a horseshoe layout, all houses of a similar design style. The appeal property is one half of a pair of semi-detached two-storey houses located on a corner and follows the same pattern as other corner properties.

4. There is a large single storey extension attached to the side of the dwelling with the front building line angled due to the corner location of the dwelling. It is above this element that the extension would be located.

5. Although the extension would be positioned away from edges of the ground floor extension, as a consequence of its location, it would appear as a bulky and disjointed addition and not an integral part of the existing extension.

6. The host dwelling has a combination of roof forms and a flat roof also. A new roof would connect into the existing dwelling and even though it would be hipped, as a combination of these rooves, would appear incongruous. It would not respect the character of the host dwelling or appear as a subordinate extension to the host dwelling.

7. Given the location of the dwelling within the street scene, the house is highly visible. The proposal would therefore be seen directly in public views and thus harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling and to the local area.

8. There may be examples of extensions to other dwellings along Hyde Way. However, even so, none share precisely the same characteristics as the proposal before me.

9. Therefore, to conclude on this main issue, the proposed extension would appear as an incongruous addition to the main dwelling and would thus harm the character and appearance of it and lead to harm arising to the character and appearance of the street scene. Therefore, it would not accord with the design expectations of 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 2020.

*Living conditions*

10. An additional bedroom would be provided creating a fourth bedroom. No part of the garden area would be built upon as a consequence of this proposal and there would be no change to the existing garden space that the occupants have at their disposal.

11. Local Plan Policy DMHB 18 advises of the importance of private outdoor amenity space for 'all new residential development and conversions' and sets out specific guidance. However, this policy is more akin to new residential accommodation as opposed to residential extensions.

12. Therefore, to rigorously apply this policy to the proposal before me would not be reasonable and I find that the scheme would not lead to harm arising to the living conditions of the existing and future occupants due to the external space that would remain.

13. Therefore, to conclude on this main issue, there would be no conflict with Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies 2020. I do not find Policy DMHB 11 Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two or Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) to be relevant in this circumstance as they relate to design or broad principles of the built environment.

**Balance and Conclusion**

14. I have found that the proposal for an additional bedroom would not give rise to detrimental living conditions for the future and existing occupants of the dwelling. However, given the harmful effect of the proposed development on the character of the dwelling and impact on the street scene, it would lead to conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

*Alison Scott*

INSPECTOR