



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2023

by Sian Griffiths BSc(Hons) DipTP MScRealEst MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3332004

8 Phelps Way, Hayes UB3 4LH

- 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 Mrs Kulwinder Kaur against the decision of the council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 28798/APP/2023/1896, dated 28 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 15 August 2023.
- The development proposed is single storey rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, street scene and wider area.
3. Phelps Way is a residential street of mostly semi-detached, two storey dwellings set behind small front gardens, many of which have been converted to off street parking. Many of the dwellings on the street have been subject to some extension and many have substantial outbuildings at the end of their rear gardens, which are generally fairly narrow, but long.
4. The appeal property is a semi-detached, two storey dwelling with a shared side driveway (shared with No 10) which provides access to a garage. At the site visit I noticed the single storey extension that had been constructed at adjoining neighbouring property No 6. From the council's submissions, that extension extends to approximately 3.6m and the extension at neighbour No 10 is similar. I was able to see from the submitted plans that the appeal proposals would extend further into the rear garden than the single storey extensions serving No's 6 and 10.
5. Policy BE1 (Built Environment) of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) (LP1) seeks development that improves and maintains the quality of the built environment.
6. Policy DMHB 11 (Design of New Development) of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) (LP2) requires that all new development (including domestic extensions) is designed to harmonise with its local context.

7. Policy DMHB 12 (Streets and Public Realm) of LP2 requires development to be integrated into its surroundings.
8. DMHD 1 (Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings) of LP2 requires that all domestic extensions do not have an adverse cumulative impact of the proposal on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area, nor adjacent dwellings and that the proposals are subordinate to the host dwelling.
9. The proposals would extend 6m into the rear garden from the back wall of the host dwelling, well beyond those of neighbouring properties and would, in my view, dwarf the host dwelling and appear disproportionate and incongruous. I consider the proposed extension would therefore result harm to the character of the host dwelling as well as the wider area.
10. I have noted the desires of the appellant to create more living space on the ground floor, but this alone is not a reason to justify an extension of this size.
11. Given the scale and massing of the proposals I consider this would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area, and the host dwelling contrary to policies BE1 of the LP2 and DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD1 of the LP2.

Conclusions

12. For the reasons given and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Sian Griffiths

INSPECTOR