
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 June 2023

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3316279

57 Warley Road, Hayes, UB4 0QB

- 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 Navjot Hear against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 15877/APP/2022/3623, dated 25 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 24 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of first floor side extension at 57 Warley Road, Hayes, UB4 0QB, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 15877/APP/2022/3623, dated 25 November 2022 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 plan: PL-01 P1.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Main issues

2. I consider that the main issues in this case are its effect on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of residents.

Reasons

3. 57 Warley Road is one of a pair of two storey semi detached houses set at an angle at the junction of Warley Road and Gledwood Avenue. Both houses have had loft conversions including alterations to the roofs from hip to gable and large flat roofed dormers. The surrounding area is residential with mainly semi detached houses of a similar style. Most have the original hipped roofs, but there are several examples of hip to gable conversions and many properties have had two storey side extensions of various styles, including several on houses angled across the corners of junctions in a similar layout to No. 57.
4. The relevant policies in this case include Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 11 and

DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) which relate to the design of development. Policy DMHD 1 sets out detailed criteria for residential extensions and DMHB 11 addresses residential amenity.

5. The appeal site has an extensive planning history including extensions and alterations. The proposed first floor extension would be constructed over part of the existing ground floor side element. It would be consistent with policy DMHD 1 in terms of its width, height, set back from the front and distance from the side boundary. The policy states that two storey side extensions will not be supported where hip to gable extensions exist, though the reasoning behind this is unclear, unless it is to avoid an undesirable cumulative effect.
6. I consider that the proposal would be subordinate in size, height and scale to the existing house and that it would not appear incongruous in the street scene. It would not adversely affect the open character of the corner siting of the pair of semis and any cumulative effect on either the house itself or the wider area would not be unacceptable in the context of the variety of extensions and other alterations to houses in the immediate surroundings.
7. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area and that it is consistent with policies BE 1, DMHD 1, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and D3.
8. The property has limited private amenity space due to its corner location and the presence of ground floor extensions. The submitted plans indicate that the existing house has four bedrooms, including a small single bedroom and one bedroom in the loft conversion. The proposal includes the conversion of the small bedroom into an ensuite for the adjoining bedroom and the provision of one bedroom in the proposed extension. The number of bedrooms would therefore remain the same and there would be no resultant adverse impact on the amount of amenity space as it stands at present. There would be an improvement in the standard of the internal accommodation.
9. I conclude that the proposal would not result in an inadequate provision of private amenity space and that it would not harm the living conditions of existing or future residents. In this respect it is consistent with policies BE 1, DMHD 1 and DMHB 11.
10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

11. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council, having regard to the tests set out in the Framework. A condition detailing the plans is necessary to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and for the avoidance of doubt. A condition relating to the materials is necessary in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR