



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 April 2025 by Kim Vo MPLAN

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/25/3360052

51 Weymouth Road, Hayes, Hillingdon UB4 8NG

- 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 Mr. Abid Shabir against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref is 14121/APP/2024/2846.
- The development proposed is for the erection of a part two storey, part single storey side extension and single storey rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a part two storey, part single storey side extension and single storey rear extension at 51 Weymouth Road, Hayes, Hillingdon UB4 8NG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 14121/APP/2024/2846, 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 the approved plans, drawing reference WR PA 01 – Rev. B; WR PA 02 – Rev. B and WR PA 03 – Rev. B.
 - 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 building.

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.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

3. I have omitted “resubmission following refusal of application ref 14121/APP/2024/962” from the description of development above for clarity and relevance purposes. It does not change any element of the scheme and so would not affect the ability of the main parties to make their cases in respect thereof.
4. A single storey side/rear extension is present to the rear of the garage which is not shown on the existing plans. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal based on the plans before me. The Council raised no concern regarding the proposed single storey side/rear element. I find no reason to disagree with their conclusions thereon. My recommendation therefore focusses on the part two-

storey, part single-storey side extension. The main issue in regard to which is its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal building is two-storeys and semi-detached, with extensions to the front, side and rear. The surrounding area is characterised by uniform pairs of semi-detached properties. This, together with the regular rhythm of gaps, establishes a sense of original consistency, which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area. However, some properties, including the appeal building, have extended their original hipped roofs into gables. The gap between the appeal building and Number 53 Weymouth Road (No. 53) is also wider due to the attached garages, with the appeal building positioned behind No. 53's front elevation.
6. The proposal would not provide a one metre setback from the main front elevation and side boundary at ground floor. It also involves a two-storey side extension where a hip to gable roof extension exists. It, therefore, fails to fully comply with Part C) of Policy DMHD 1 under Appendix A of the London Borough of Hillingdon - Local Plan Part 2 2020 (LP P2).
7. Whilst the setbacks at ground floor would not be achieved, this is already the case with the attached garage. The one metre setbacks would also be provided at first floor. These, together with the existing wide gap and the appeal building's positioning, would ensure that the regular rhythm of gaps is maintained along the street scene. Additionally, the proposal will have a slim appearance and would not exceed the width limits of Part C). The ridge height would be well below the main ridgeline with matching eaves. Due to its subordinate size and use of matching materials, it would integrate well with the host dwelling. The proposed hipped roof design would also complement the surrounding original hipped roofs.
8. For these reasons, the proposed part two-storey and part single-storey side extension would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Whilst it would not meet all the criteria under Part C) of Policy DMHD 1 under Appendix A of LP P2, it would achieve its overarching aims for new extensions to appear subordinate and to have no adverse impact on the character, appearance or quality of the street. It would not conflict with Policy BE1 of the Local Plan: Part 1 2012 and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the LP P2. Together, and amongst other things, these seek to ensure developments are designed to the highest standards and are well integrated with the surrounding area.

Other Matter

9. There are multiple differences between appeal Ref APP/R5510/D/23/3333501 and the scheme before me. Mainly in what have been substantial revisions to the design. Such that my findings here stand.

Conditions

10. To provide certainty and for enforcement purposes, it is necessary to impose the standard time limit and specify the approved plans. A condition is also necessary for materials to match those used on the existing building to maintain the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed given it would comply with the development plan and there is nothing compelling to suggest a decision other than in accordance therewith.

Kim Vo

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions set out.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR