



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 02 August 2022 by S Wilson LLB MSc LRTPI

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3297406

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/2021/4277, dated 19 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is 'Demolition of existing single storey side extension and conservatory to facilitate part single storey and part two storey side and rear extensions.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing single storey side extension and conservatory to facilitate part single storey and part two storey side and rear extensions at 31 Manor Road, Hayes, UB3 2DG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 954/APP/2021/4277, dated 19 November 2021 and the plans submitted with it, 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: Location Plan, 102 Rev F, Site Block Plan.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the proposed development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. No 31 is a two-storey corner plot house located at the start of Manor Road and on the junction with Addison Way. It is the beginning of a terrace of 4 houses

which have a 'bookend' layout. As such No 31 has a prominent forward elevation with dual pitched front gable and is finished to the rear and side with a half-hipped roof as is the style of the area. There is an existing single storey side extension, a rear pergola style structure and a rear conservatory.

5. Addison Way dissects the wider area creating two distinct areas. To the north are multi storey and high-rise residential properties interspersed with open space and the arterial A4020 beyond. To the south are Rectory Road, Manor Road, Central Avenue, Harrow View, and Wesley Road which present largely uniform groupings of 4 properties in a largely bookend terrace form and of similar age. The original front elevations along those roads appear largely unchanged, creating a distinct character and contributing positively to the area. However, there are multiple examples of side and rear extensions, including several corner plot extensions.
6. The separation distance of the external wall of the proposal and the side boundary would be in excess of the policy requirement in the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies (adopted January 2020) (LPP2). The outcome would be a similar or larger gap to the boundary to that of other corner plot properties on junctions with Addison Way, particularly those already extended. Consequently, the proposal would be an adequate distance away from the boundary to ensure that it would not appear cramped and would maintain the openness of the area.
7. The proposed hipped roof and use of matching materials would respect the original dwelling design. To the rear the proposed extension would be well balanced and proportionate to the rear elevation as a whole. With the lower roof ridge, it would appear subordinate to the main dwelling. Although the side elevation would be quite deep, it would be partly screened at ground floor level and broken by windows at first floor. Furthermore, the set back from the front elevation at first-floor level would break up the overall massing.
8. Consequently, although both the side and rear elevations would be clearly visible from the road, the proposal would not appear dominant or intrusive and would integrate effectively and subordinately into the original form of the dwelling and the terrace. Given the presence of other various designs of side extensions to these bookend terraces, it would harmonise with the local context and the architectural composition of the dwelling and terrace.
9. The proposal would therefore achieve a satisfactory design and would leave a more than adequate garden space, so would not represent overdevelopment of the plot.
10. In conclusion, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it complies with LPP2 Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 which require development to be of high-quality design that respects the original house and the area.

Other Matters

11. I have considered the previous appeal on this site which the Council has brought to my attention (Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3253061). That scheme was significantly different to the current proposal. The footprint of the extension was wider and larger overall, with a gable to the side. The current proposal has significantly less width and utilises a hipped roof, which

significantly reduce the bulk and impact of the proposed extensions, so is materially different to the previous scheme. That Inspector noted a clear conflict with LPP2 Policy DMHD 1, whereas the proposal before me complies with that and other development plan policies. I have therefore reached a different conclusion on the merits of the scheme before me.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, I recommend that a condition requiring the development to accord with the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty and precision. A condition requiring the use of materials matching the existing building is necessary to ensure an appropriate appearance for the development.
13. The Council's report suggested that the side elevation windows could be conditioned to be obscure glazed; however, I do not consider it is necessary to impose such a condition as there is no opportunity for close overlooking of neighbours. Furthermore, their presence will assist with natural surveillance of the nearby open space.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

S Wilson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and agree with the recommendation. On that basis the appeal allowed subject to the conditions listed above.

L McKay

INSPECTOR