



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2023

by **J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3320389

52 Dale Drive, Hayes, Hillingdon, UB4 8AU

- 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 Mikel Mahmutaj against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 5856/APP/2023/77, dated 10 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 27 March 2023.
- The development proposed is Two storey side extension and part two storey, part single storey rear extension (following demolition of side garage addition and single storey rear extension).

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Two storey side extension and part two storey, part single storey rear extension (following demolition of side garage addition and single storey rear extension) at 52 Dale Drive, Hayes, UB4 8AU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 5856/APP/2023/77, dated 10 January 2023.

Procedural Matters

2. At the time of my site visit the development was complete. The proposal is therefore retrospective and I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.
3. The Council changed the description of development from that stated on the application form in the interests of clarity. I consider that the amended description accurately describes the appeal scheme and accordingly I have used this description in the banner heading above.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the semi-detached pair and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling, located in a road comprising of mainly semi-detached dwellings of a similar design and appearance.
6. Planning permission was granted in 2022 for a two storey side and single storey side and rear extension to the dwelling under LPA ref. 5856/APP/2022/2856 (the consented scheme). The current proposal seeks

amendments to the consented scheme and proposes to extend the approved two storey side element deeper into the site. The extension would also wrap around the rear façade, extending beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling by 3.1 metres. The property also has an existing large dormer across the rear roof slope of the original dwelling.

7. The proposed front elevation of the dwelling is as originally approved under LPA ref. 5856/APP/2022/2856. The consented two storey side extension has a lower ridge height than the original dwelling and therefore appears subservient to it. The proposed additional extensions at first floor level are designed with a shallow double gable on the rear elevation where the top of each gable is significantly lower than the ridge height of both the original dwelling and the consented two-storey side extension.
8. The proposed side extension is the same width as the consented side extension and as such, does not add to the overall width of the dwelling. The proposed extensions do not extend across the full width of the original dwelling, leaving a 3 metre gap to the party boundary with the attached dwelling, 54 Dale Drive.
9. The proposed extensions whilst large, are of an acceptable scale, bulk and design such that they do not appear unduly prominent or visually intrusive. The rear extension sits comfortably below the existing rear dormer which remains the most prominent feature of the rear elevation of the dwelling. The proposed extensions are painted render and match the appearance of the remainder of the dwelling. In my opinion the proposed extensions appear sufficiently subordinate to the host dwelling and I am satisfied that the extensions are not significantly harmful to its character and appearance.
10. The adjoining semi-detached dwelling, 54 Dale Drive has also been significantly extended, including two storey side and rear extensions and a rear dormer. Given the extent of the approved alterations and extensions to both properties, I am not convinced that the appeal proposal results in any significant material harm to the character and appearance of the semi-detached pair, particularly as the more prominent front elevation remains the same as already consented.
11. The dwelling is located at the end of Dale Drive and whilst the side elevation of the consented two storey extension is visible, views of the flank elevation of the additional proposed extensions which extend deeper into the site, are not readily obtainable. However, more distant views of the rear elevation of the dwelling are obtainable from the access road leading to Hayes Park School and through the gaps between the dwellings in Raynton Drive. In this regard, the existing rear dormer is the most dominant feature of the dwelling, with the extensions that are the subject of this appeal appearing more subservient.
12. Thus, I conclude that the proposal does not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the semi-detached pair or the surrounding area. It therefore complies with Policies BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (January 2020) and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021). These policies, amongst other matters, seek to ensure developments are of a high quality design which respects the design of the original property and surrounding area.

Other Matters

13. With regard to third party representations, I am satisfied that a sufficient amount of amenity space is retained for the occupants of the dwelling. I am also satisfied that the proposal does not lead to any significant overlooking of neighbouring dwellings or the adjacent school. Any subsequent applications at the appeal site or to nearby properties would be determined on their own merits.

Conditions

14. The Council consider conditions relating to the implementation of the permission, approved plans and materials to be used should be imposed if the appeal is allowed. However, these are not relevant or necessary as the development is complete.

Conclusion

15. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR