
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2025 by Elizabeth Davies BSc (Hons) MIEMA, CEnv

Decision by F Wilkinson BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3356623

65 Hunters Grove, Hayes, Hillingdon UB3 3JE

- 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 Saud Ahmad against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 14399/APP/2024/1703.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in the appeal are:
 - the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area; and
 - the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 63 Hunters Grove (No. 63), with regard to outlook and light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling located on the corner of Hunters Grove and Crossway. It has a detached garage to the side and some off-road parking at the front. Its semi-pair is No. 63. Hunters Grove and Crossway are residential in nature with semi-detached dwellings built in a similar style and pattern. The appeal property lies on the edge of 'East and West Walk, Botwell Area of Special Local Character'. The appeal property is largely unaltered and overall makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area through contributing to the general uniformity of the style and pattern of development in the vicinity.
5. The proposed single storey rear extension would span the full width of the property and project 6m beyond the rear elevation. The extension would almost double the

size of the ground floor of the host dwelling, appearing at odds with the original plan form. The proposed extension would not step in from the flank wall of the main dwelling but would be flush with it. That lack of articulation would contribute to the appearance of a dominant extension. The large scale and mass of the proposed extension would not be subordinate to the modestly sized host dwelling.

6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area contrary to Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021), Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (adopted 2012) (the 'Local Plan (Part 1)') and Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) (the 'Local Plan (Part 2)') and the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework'). Amongst other things, these seek to ensure development is of a high quality design and an appropriate scale. It is also contrary to Policy DMHB 5 of the Local Plan Part 2 which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure extensions within areas of Special Local Character are subservient to the original building.

Living Conditions

7. No. 63 has a number of rear facing windows at ground floor, serving a bathroom and kitchen. My attention has not been drawn to any definition of habitable room within a policy or associated guidance. However, in my experience, bathrooms are not normally considered to be habitable rooms, while kitchens often are. The proposed extension would extend around 6m along the common boundary with no.63 at a height of up to around 2.95m which is likely to block some daylight from reaching the windows and the rooms that they serve. An unsatisfactory living environment would therefore occur.
8. Although the proposed extension would be single storey, it would nevertheless be clearly visible above the wall along the common boundary. The proposed extension would cause a sense of enclosure for the occupants of No. 63 owing to its proximity, depth and height. When looking out the kitchen window and using the part of the garden closest to the dwelling, the occupants would find the extension overbearing and enclosing. Overall, the impacts for the occupants of No.63 in respect of their outlook and their enjoyment of light would be significantly different from the existing impact of the brick wall that currently separates the properties.
9. Whilst I note that occupiers of neighbouring properties, including No.63 have not objected to the proposal, I must consider the living conditions of existing and future occupiers of the neighbouring properties as required by the development plan and the Framework.
10. I find that the proposal would harm the living conditions of the occupants of No. 63 by causing an unacceptable loss of light and outlook. It would be contrary to Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021) which seeks, amongst other things to deliver good design. It is also contrary to Policy BE1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) and Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the Local Plan (Part 2) and the Framework which seek, amongst other things, to ensure development protects the outlook and amenity of neighbouring residents.

Other Matters

11. I have had regard to the fact that there are other rear extensions to buildings on Crossway and elsewhere, but I have determined this appeal on its own particular facts, impacts and planning merits.
12. The appellant's comments on the change to permitted development rights are noted, but have no bearing on this case. The appellant's wish to renovate the property and provide more indoor living space, including a home office and improved living standards are understood, however these considerations do not outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elizabeth Davies

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

F Wilkinson

3356623

INSPECTOR