



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 April 2025 by F Bradford BA (Hons)

Decision by Mr A Spencer-Peet BSc(Hons) PGDip.LP Solicitor (Non Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/25/3359028

130 The Fairway, Ruislip, HA4 0SH

- 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 Gulraiz Ghafoor against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref is 67889/APP/2024/2455.
- The development proposed is a 5.5m rear extension with 2 roof lights (3m max height, 2.943m eaves height).

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 5.5m rear extension with 2 roof lights (3m max height, 2.943m eaves height) at 130 The Fairway, Ruislip, HA4 0SH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 67889/APP/2024/2455, and the plans submitted with it, 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: Site Location Plan, Existing and Proposed Block Plan 00, Existing Site Plan 01, Proposed Site Plan 02, Existing and Proposed Floor Plans 03, Existing Elevations 04, Proposed Elevations 06.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue of the proposed development is its effect on the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and wider locality.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling, located within a row of dwellings along the north-western edge of The Fairway. Running parallel at the rear is a mirrored row of dwellings, forming the south-eastern edge of East Mead. The resulting arrangement is facing rear elevations of The Fairway and East Mead, with private gardens in between. The dwellings located on The Fairway, are of mixed

character and grain featuring mainly detached and semi-detached dwellings whereas those on East Mead are of established terrace form. Many of the dwellings have undergone alteration and extension over time. Due to the layout of development within the area, the ground floor rear-elevation of dwellings remain largely obscured from public view, including that of the appeal property.

5. The proposed development would introduce a substantial rear, single-storey extension which would be of similar footprint to the existing host dwelling. Its design would be typical of other rear extensions on dwellings of The Fairway and East Mead, though would be larger in depth than many. However, due to its modest height, the massing of the proposed extension does not appear as a bulky nor dominating addition to the host dwelling. Therefore, whilst the proposed development would lack subservience in terms of its footprint, its overall relationship to the host dwelling would be subordinate and would not harm its character and appearance when seen from nearby and neighbouring properties on The Fairway and East Mead.
6. The proposed development would be visibly obscured from the public realm as a result of its siting and the urban layout. Therefore, the proposed development would result in negligible material change to the streetscapes of The Fairway, Queens Walk, and East Mead and thus would not harm the character and appearance of the area.
7. I acknowledge that the proposed development would not comply with the specific technicalities of subsection B(i) of policy DMHD1 (Alterations and Extensions to Residential Buildings), which sets out that the proposed development should not exceed 4 metres in depth in this context. However, for the reasons above, the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the host property, wider area or street scene in terms of character and appearance. Consequently, the proposed development would comply with the overarching objectives of the policy which, amongst other things, aims to ensure that extensions to residential dwellings are appropriate to the local context and are subordinate to the host dwelling.
8. For the reasons above, I find that the proposed extension would not conflict with the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan policies BE1 (Built Environment), DMHB11 (Design of New Development), DMHB12 (Streets and Public Realm) which, together and amongst other things, aims to ensure development is well integrated with the surrounding area and harmonises with the local context. For the above reasons, I further find that the proposed extension would not conflict with policy DMHD1 (Alterations and Extensions to Residential Buildings) of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan.

Conditions

9. The council has indicated a list of conditions it sees necessary in the event that the appeal is allowed. I have considered these against the advice set out within the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) and Planning Practice Guidance.
10. A condition is required to ensure that development accords with the statutory requirement that development starts no later than three years from the date of this decision. A condition is also required to ensure that development is carried out in accordance with the submitted plans, for certainty. In the interests of ensuring that the impact of development to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area is acceptable, a condition is required which ensures that the proposed extension is constructed in materials which match those of the host dwelling.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Finlay Bradford

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Mr A Spencer-Peet

INSPECTOR