



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 March 2025

by **C Housden BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3350421

74 Tolcarne Drive, Eastcote, Hillingdon HA5 2DG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Gita Hirani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application ref is 8306/APP/2024/1179.
 - The development proposed is described as “single storey rear and side extension”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear and side extension at 74 Tolcarne Drive, Eastcote, Hillingdon HA5 2DG in accordance with the terms of the application ref 8306/APP/2024/1179, 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 accordance with drawing nos C55/74TOL/24/OS, C55/74TOL/24/PL1, C55/74TOL/24/PL2 and C55/74TOL/24/PL3.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Tolcarne Drive predominantly comprises pairs of semi-detached properties with common architectural features, set in a regular pattern along a mostly linear building line. Many properties within Tolcarne Drive have single storey side extensions which extend up to the shared boundaries, however gaps above ground floor level are commonplace. The area is suburban in character.
4. No 74 Tolcarne Drive (No 74) is a semi-detached two storey property with a double garage side extension, although I noted on my site visit that this has been partially demolished. No 74 has a wider plot than most within the area, and its neighbour at No 72C Tolcarne Drive is set behind the appeal site rather than directly adjacent to it.

5. The Council has identified that there has been recent tree and vegetation clearance at the site. Whilst I do not have the circumstances behind the vegetation clearance before me, I observed on my visit that the frontage of the plot was open with vegetation limited to grass and a small ornamental hedge.
6. The Council have identified that the depth of the rear extension slightly exceeds the criteria contained within Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) (HLPP2 DMP). However, the Council have confirmed that they consider this element of the proposal acceptable due to these types of extensions being a common feature within the area and the extension appearing as a subordinate addition that would not be harmful to the character of the host property and wider area. Based on the evidence before me, I see no reason to disagree with this assessment in relation to the rear extension.
7. In relation to side extensions, criteria C) i) of Policy DMHD 1 sets out that side extensions should not exceed half the width of the original property. The subtext of the policy confirms this is to ensure the size and width of an extension does not dominate the original property and to ensure the extension appears subordinate. However, I note that the wording of the policy does not dictate an absolute limitation on the width of an extension and does not account for the unique individual circumstances of each site.
8. In the context of Tolcarne Drive, the vast majority of properties extend to the boundary of their respective plots through single storey side extensions. Whilst the appeal site has an open frontage and the proposed extension would be wider than most within the area, it would extend to the boundary fencing and keep the plot open above ground floor level which would appear in keeping with the wider pattern of development.
9. Whilst I note that the height would be slightly taller than the original side extension, I am satisfied that the proposed side extension is of appropriate height, bulk and mass that would be appropriately proportioned to the site and would have a subservient appearance that would not dominate the host property. As such, the appeal proposal would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host property and wider area.
10. For the reasons that I have given, the proposed development would accord with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the HLPP2 DMP. These policies require new development to incorporate principles of good design that improves and maintains the quality of the built environment.

Other Matters

11. The Council has referred to there not being a precedent within Tolcarne Drive for exceeding the width specified in Policy DMHD 1. I am satisfied that my decision on this proposal, on this particular site with its distinct characteristics would not harm the ability of the Council to exercise their judgement on matters of character and appearance in future cases.

Conditions

12. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against the tests in the Framework and the advice in Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

13. The standard timescale condition for implementation and a plans compliance condition are imposed for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty.
14. I have imposed a condition requiring materials to match the proposed dwelling. This is necessary to ensure the proposal would be in keeping with the character of the host property and wider area. I note that the Council has ticked no in its questionnaire in relation to this condition. However, having considered the six tests set out in the Framework, I am satisfied that this condition meets them all and is therefore appropriate to impose.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, the proposal would accord with the development plan as a whole, and there are no material considerations that indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, subject to the conditions set out in my decision.

C Housden

INSPECTOR