



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 April 2025

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/25/3360491

15 Brookside Road, Hayes UB4 0PQ

- 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 Jasbinder Sandher against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Reference is 30809/APP/2024/3054.
 - The development proposed the erection of a first-floor extension to the side/rear, following the replacement of existing rear extension roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a first-floor extension to the side/rear, following the replacement of existing rear extension roof at 15 Brookside Road, Hayes UB4 0PQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 30809/APP/2024/3054, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 0019 – 100, 110, 120, 200, 210, 220 & 230.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is an end of terrace two storey dwelling on a corner plot. The house has pleasing principal elevations and a fully hipped roof and has a single storey element to its return road side and its rear. It is in a well-established area of residential character with a pleasant suburban streetscene formed in the main by a range of semi-detached and terraced properties. The proposal is as described above.
-

4. The Council is concerned, in summary, that the planned development at first floor level would be too bulky, overly close a gap, appear cramped and overdeveloped and generally impact upon immediate and wider aesthetic qualities.
5. The appeal property is one of six which front a small 'green' and share a sense of general symmetry and cottage style aesthetics adding markedly to the character of the area. The planned extension, seen from the front angle, would not overly impinge upon this as due to height, set-back and set-in it would be subordinate to the main elevation. The openness at the junction area of Brookside Road and Dorchester Way is presently visually beneficial. However, once again with the planned lower roof design and set-in I would deem that visual intrusion would not feature in the scene. This is more so because of the unusually generous verges and highway design which abut the host property. The dwelling itself has a reasonable sized plot, one of the longest in the area. Given all this, and with matching materials and, I note, well-designed windows, my opinion is that the scheme would be relatively innocuous in its immediate and wider context and would not intrude upon a gap or be seen as overdevelopment.
6. Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part Two (2020) and Policies D4 and D8 of the London Plan (2021) are relevant. These policies share common themes of seeking to protect the character and appearance of buildings and their neighbourhood, to ensure harmonious development and the safeguarding of local distinctiveness. I conclude that the scheme would not run contrary to these policies.

Conditions

7. The scheme should have the standard commencement condition. The Council suggests the requirement for materials to match the existing building. I agree this condition would be appropriate in the interests of visual amenity. I also agree that there should be a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans; to provide certainty.

Overall conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character or appearance of the host property or the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR