



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 June 2026

by **D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 July 2026

Appeal Ref: 6007587

79 Fairholme Crescent, Hayes, Middlesex UB4 8QU

- 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 Dylan Swift against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 53556/APP/2025/1948.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey extension to the side/rear and conversion to a self-contained studio for a wheelchair user.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The revised National Planning Policy Framework was published in December 2025 but does not raise any new matters which affect the assessment of this appeal scheme.

Main Issues

3. It is considered that the main issues are the effects of the proposed development on (a) the character and appearance of the surrounding area, in particular the streetscene, and (b) the safety of other highway users.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site comprises part of the curtilage of 79 Fairholme Crescent which is a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling situated within a primarily residential area comprising a mix of dwelling types, including some bungalows. However, the streetscene adjacent to the property is primarily 2-storey semi-detached dwellings with pitched roof forms that are set back from the footways along Fairholme Crescent. Unlike other pairs of semi-detached dwellings, there is a driveway to the side of the property providing access to rear garages. Between the driveway and the side elevation of the property is a wide gap which forms part of the garden.
5. As described, the appeal is for a single storey extension to the side and rear of No. 79. The council has previously granted planning permission for the erection of a 2-storey extension to the side and rear of No. 79 (Ref 53556/APP/2022/1860). The full details of this previously approved scheme have not been provided, and it is

noted that the permission was granted over 3-years ago. Although the appellant claims that the approved scheme was for a substantially larger 2-storey addition and it is of direct relevance to the assessment of this appeal, in the absence of the current and full planning circumstances only limited weight can be given to the approved scheme.

6. The erection of a domestic single storey side extension to No. 79 to create additional living space for its occupiers would reflect the bulk and scale other additions that have been erected within the surrounding area, including at Nos. 77 and 110. However, the proposed development would result in the creation of a separate dwellinghouse which is intended to be a self-contained studio for a wheelchair user, rather than being a domestic extension to No. 79.
7. By reason of being an independent single storey dwellinghouse with a predominantly flat roof, the design of the proposed development would appear an incongruous form of development within the streetscene that is primarily characterised by 2-storey semi-detached dwellings. There are some bungalows, but they have pitched roofs which reflect the design of the 2-storey dwellings and are of a similar width. This identified harm associated with the design of the appeal scheme would be accentuated by the narrow width of the proposed dwelling and the smaller size of the front window when compared to the surrounding dwellings.
8. There is a wide gap to the side of No. 79, and the proposed development would not be sited forward of its front elevation. However, the sub-division of the curtilage and the erection of an additional dwelling within this gap would result in the appearance of a cramped form of residential development. Although only single storey in height, the appeal scheme would also result in the appearance of a short terrace of 3-dwellings that would disrupt the predominant rhythm, character and appearance of the pairs of 2-storey semi-detached dwellings fronting this part of Fairholme Crescent. The potential use of external materials to match those of No. 79 would not mitigate the unacceptable harm which has been identified.
9. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, in particular the streetscene, and, as such, it would conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies and Policy DMHB11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (DMP). Amongst other matters, these policies require all development to be designed to the highest standards and to incorporate principles of good design, such as harmonising with the local context by taking into account the surroundings, including building plot sizes and widths, established street patterns, rooflines and streetscape rhythm.
10. DMP Policy DMHB12 concerns the public realm rather than the type of development proposed. Policy D1 of the London Plan (LP) is directed at undertaking character assessments and the drafting of development plan policies rather than the design of individual schemes. LP Policy D4 concerns larger scale proposals rather than the erection of a single dwelling.

Highway Safety

11. Based upon DMP Policy DMT6 and Table 1 at Appendix C, the council's assessment of the off-street parking provision for the appeal scheme is for 2 spaces for No. 79 and 1 space for the proposed dwelling. Based upon the site visit,

it appears that there could potentially be off-street 3 parking spaces within the front garden of No. 79 as claimed by the appellant.

12. However, and in the absence of any detailed layout drawing accompanying this appeal, it has not been adequately demonstrated how this front garden could accommodate a parking space with an associated manoeuvring area for a wheelchair user together with 2 other parking spaces as required by DMP Appendix C. Further, because of the available garden width one of the spaces could be in front of the front door of the proposed dwelling which could impede access, especially for a wheelchair user if there is insufficient manoeuvring space. Accordingly, the council's concerns about the potential to displace vehicle parking from the front garden of No. 79 to along Fairholme Crescent has some merit. If this appeal succeeds, imposing the council's suggested condition would retrospectively demonstrate whether or not there is the ability to park 3 vehicles within the garden.
13. DMP Policy DMT6 requires that any variance from the parking standards in Appendix C should not lead to a deleterious impact on street parking provision, congestion or local amenity. There are some parking restrictions which operate along Fairholme Crescent associated with the near-by junctions, including the road almost opposite the appeal site which provides access to an area of open space. There are also a significant number of dropped kerbs which enable access for off-street parking but reduce the spaces available for on-street parking.
14. However, during the morning site visit it was observed that there were several on-street parking spaces available which could be used by a vehicle displaced from parking within the front garden of No. 79 without causing a danger to other highway users, including by reason of obstructing the flow of traffic. For this reason, there would not be a conflict with DMP Policy DMT6 and also DMP Policies DMT1 and DMT2 and LP Policy T4 because there would not be either significant adverse transport impacts on the local environment or the material deterioration of the safety of all road users and residents.
15. Cycle parking provision within the curtilage of the proposed dwelling could be secured by a suitable condition. This would also address the requirements of DMP Policy DMT5 and LP Policy T5 concerning safe access for cyclists.
16. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause significant harm to the safety of other highway users and, as such, it would not conflict with DMP Policies DMT1, DMT2, DMT5 and DMT6 and LP Policies T4 and T5. LP Policy T2 concerning healthy Streets is not considered to be of direct relevance to the type of development proposed.

Conclusion

17. Although the proposed development would not cause significant harm to the safety of other highway users, this matter is demonstrably outweighed by the unacceptable harm which would be caused to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, in particular the streetscene. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR