



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5<sup>th</sup> September 2023

**by Megan Thomas K.C. Barrister-at-Law**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 26 September 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3323974**

**32 Wyre Grove, Hayes UB3 4PJ**

- 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 Naresh Kumar against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref.26480/APP/2023/512 dated 22 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 19 April 2023.
  - The development proposed is "first floor side and part rear extension".
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues in the appeal are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and streetscene and the effect on the living conditions of the occupants of 34 Wyre Grove in relation to outlook.

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

3. The appeal site comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling located on the west side of Wyre Grove. Its semi-pair is no.30 Wyre Grove to its north. To its south is no.34 Wyre Grove which is also a semi, paired with no.36. The appeal site and no.34 are both built up to their common boundary with frontage-facing single storey elements with differing roofs. Wyre Grove, where the appeal site is located, is a residential street of principally semi-detached properties and short terraces standing in fairly small plots.
4. At the rear the appeal site has a ground floor rear extension and a connected conservatory. There is a large outbuilding at the end of the garden.
5. The property benefits from a Certificate of Proposed Lawful Development (dated December 2022) in relation to a hip-to-gable extension with two rooflights in the front roof slope and a dormer structure in the rear roof slope with two rear facing windows. This development has not yet taken place. If it took place a spatial gap between the flank elevation of the property and no.34 at first floor level would remain.

6. The proposal involves the erection of a first floor side/part rear extension with a new gable end roof at the front of the property with a hipped roof behind. The gable end of the roof would be located on the common boundary with no.34. The first floor rear extension would wrap around behind the proposed first floor side extension almost matching the width up to the boundary. It would be set down from the original roof ridge and would have a hipped roof form.
7. Whilst the proposed first floor side extension would be set back from the front elevation of the dwelling, it would not be set down at all from the roof ridge or set in from the common boundary. From the front, the proposal would entirely remove the gap which exists at first floor level between nos 32 and 34. This would continue to be the case to a similar (but not identical) degree if the fallback development permitted by the Certificate was constructed. The spacing would be lost and this currently gives the host property its own identity and distinctiveness and marries it with its semi-pair. Even with the fallback development implemented I consider that these characteristics would endure. The gap also contributes to the openness of the streetscene. I note that policy DMHD 1 encourages a minimum one metre gap from the side boundary and whilst this is not possible at ground floor level, it is in this particular case an appropriate minimum for a first floor side extension.
8. I have borne in mind that no.34 has submitted a similar scheme to the appeal scheme which would involve development up to the common boundary also. The latter scheme is not before me and I make no judgment on its own particular isolated merits. It has been refused but it may be appealed. It may never be granted permission or be built. However in potential circumstances where both schemes went ahead there would theoretically be a row of 4 terraced houses. However, I am in agreement with the Council that this could not be done with adequate design quality because of the different materials, frontages, fenestration and designs of the two pairs of semi-detached properties. The typical uniformity and consequent attractiveness of terraced rows of properties could not be achieved. The result would be detrimental.
9. I am also concerned that the roof form of the linked hipped roof at the rear of the property would add an additional shape of roof which, when taken with dormer structure, would result in a complicated and distracting design.
10. On this issue, I conclude that the proposed development would unduly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and streetscene and would be contrary to policies DMHD1 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies (adopted 2020).

*Living conditions of Occupants at no.34 Wyre Grove*

11. Given the height and depth of the proposed side elevation of the scheme and its location along the common boundary with no.34 Wyre Grove, it would appear overbearing for the occupants of no.34 when arriving at their front door and when using their front forecourt and, to a lesser extent, their rear garden. It would give an undue sense of enclosure as well as being a plain blank façade and overbearing.
12. On this issue, I conclude that the proposal would harm the living conditions of the occupants of 34 Wyre Grove by reason of loss of outlook. It would be

contrary to policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2- Development Management Policies (adopted 2020).

**Conclusion**

13. Having taken into account all representations made, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

*Megan Thomas K.C.*

INSPECTOR