



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2025

by J Heppell BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3350195

15 Manton Close, Hayes, UB3 2BA

- 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 Mr A Bajwa against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 78826/APP/2024/1495.
 - The development proposed is a wraparound single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a wraparound single storey side extension at 15 Manton Close, Hayes, UB3 2BA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 78826/APP/2024/1495, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos 3762/01/JG, 3762/02/JG, 3762/03/JG, 3762/04/JG and 3762/05/JG.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Preliminary Matters

2. The existing elevation plans submitted with the appeal show a different roof shape on the house to that which I observed on site. The roof of the property is hipped and there is no dormer window. This discrepancy has not affected my assessment of the appeal proposals or my conclusions.
3. New evidence was introduced by the appellant at appeal stage, namely several planning decisions, that the local planning authority was invited to comment on but declined to do so, on the basis that they were content to rely on the officer report.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is situated in a residential area characterised by terraced and semi-detached properties. Manton Close is a cul-de-sac, with the road forming a

loop around a central grassed area, with terraced dwellings on three sides. The appeal property is an end terrace dwelling. The appellant proposes to demolish the existing attached garage and single storey rear extension and replace them with a wraparound single storey extension occupying a similar footprint to the existing garage but extending further to the rear.

6. The side element of the extension would have a similar setback to the existing garage, with a roof only slightly higher than the garage, and consequently it would have a minimal impact on the street scene. The rear element of the extension would not be visible from public vantage points, and when seen by neighbouring properties at the rear would differ little in appearance from the current rear extension. As it would occupy only a small proportion of the well-sized rear garden, the extension would not appear cramped or incongruous.
7. Whilst the extension would be deeper than the current rear extension, its visual impact would be ameliorated by fact that the adjoining property no 16 Manton Close has been extended at the rear, meaning that the proposed extension would not appear excessively deep. Because the appeal property is an end terrace, and the adjacent property no 14 Manton Close is angled away from it, the deeper building line of the extension would not be unduly prominent and would not represent a departure from the prevailing character and appearance of the area.
8. Paragraph A1.7 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (DMP) advises that rear extensions should not protrude too far out from the rear wall of the original house, and policy DMHD 1 of the DMP limits the depth of single storey rear extensions on terraced or semi-detached properties to 3.3 metres (where the plot width is 5 metres or less) or 3.6 metres (where the plot width exceeds 5 metres). The appellant though has supplied a number of planning permissions for rear extensions in Hillingdon which exceed the limitations imposed by policy DMHD 1, where the Council was satisfied that there would not be unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. Whilst the details of these schemes differ from that applied for here, the flexible application of the policy in the absence of unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area lends support to my reasoning in this case.
9. Accordingly, I conclude that the appeal proposal would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area, and would therefore comply with policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the DMP, which require the incorporation of the principles of good design into new development. For the reasons given above, I attach limited weight to the conflict with the maximum rear extension depth imposed by policy DMHD 1.
10. Conflict with policies DMHB 1 and DMHB 4, which relate to heritage assets and conservation areas, was also cited by the Council in its decision notice. However, although on the basis of the information I have been provided with, the appeal site is close to the boundary of the Hayes Village Conservation Area, it does not make any contribution to the significance of this designated heritage asset, and the proposed development would not adversely affect its setting. No conflict with these policies would therefore occur.
11. Taking all these matters into account, I find that the proposal would comply with the development plan considered as a whole, and there are no material considerations that outweigh this finding.

Conditions

12. In the interests of certainty, I have attached a condition listing the approved plans. To ensure that the appearance of the extension reflects the host property, I have attached a condition requiring that the external materials of the extension match those used in the existing dwelling.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

J Heppell

INSPECTOR