



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2016

by Caroline Mulloy BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 19th October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/16/3150502

4 Deane Avenue, Ruislip, Middlesex HA4 6SR

- 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 Miss McGuire against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 67986/APP/2016/632, dated 17 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is conversion of granny annexe in existing single storey side and rear extension to a 1 bedroom self-contained flat with associated parking and amenity space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for conversion of granny annexe in existing single storey side and rear extension to a 1 bedroom self-contained flat with associated parking and amenity space at 4 Deane Avenue, Ruislip, Middlesex HA4 8HR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 67986/APP/2016/632, dated 17 February 2016, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions set out in the Schedule attached to this Decision.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposal is different on the application form to the decision notice. I have used the description on the decision notice which I consider to be a more accurate reflection of the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is whether the proposal would result in over-development or over-intensification of the residential use of the site and if so, whether it would be out of character with the immediate locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The host property is a two-storey detached dwelling situated on the north-western side of Deane Avenue. The dwelling has an extension to the roof by way of an altered hip to gable end and rear dormer. The dwelling also has an existing mono-pitch roof single-storey side extension that links with a wrap around single storey rear extension. This side extension forms 'granny annexe' accommodation for an elderly relative. The Council considers that the proposal would result in an over-development and over-intensification of the site which would be out of character with the residential functioning of the immediate locality.
-

5. The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of semi-detached and detached single family dwelling houses with a variety of architectural styles. The proposal would utilise an existing building and no external alterations are proposed, other than to create a separate amenity area to serve the proposed unit in the rear garden. Consequently, no harm to the character and appearance of the area would arise.
6. The Council contends that the proposal would result in a significant loss of floor space from the existing main dwelling which is of a standard size to service the requirements of a 4 bedroom single family occupancy property. The property was originally a three bedroom property which was converted into a four bedroom property by way of a conversion to the roof space. The original ground floor accommodation comprising of living room, dining room and kitchen would remain. Indeed the kitchen area benefits from an extension to the rear which forms part of the wrap around extension to the rear and side. The proposal would result in a shared entrance lobby; however, this would only result in a small loss of floor space and there is no evidence that this would harm the living conditions of the existing occupier. There is no evidence before me that the proposal would result in the floor space of the host property or the appeal proposal being below any recommended standards.
7. Furthermore, I am mindful that the original property could have been extended to create an additional bedroom by way of a conversion to the roof space, without the benefit of the additional side extension. Moreover, the proposal would not result in the loss of a four bedroom family home which would remain. Consequently, whilst the proposal would result in a unit which is smaller than the predominant housing type in the area, there is no evidence before me to suggest that this would result in harm to the character or appearance of the surrounding area or to the living conditions of the occupiers of the host property, surrounding occupiers or future occupiers of the appeal proposal.
8. Policy 3.8 of the London Plan (LP) (consolidated with alterations since 2011) 2015 seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that new developments offer a range of housing choices, in terms of the mix of housing sizes and types, taking into account of the housing requirements of different groups and the changing roles of different sectors in meeting these. The proposal would result in a small self-contained unit which would meet the needs of small households. Furthermore, the proposal would retain the four bedroom property. I, therefore, consider that the proposal would contribute to housing choice and in accordance with Policy 3.8.
9. I, therefore, conclude that the proposal would not result in an over-intensification or over-development of the site which would be out of character with the immediate locality. It would not, therefore, conflict with Policy 3.8 of the London Plan. In addition, I find no conflict with saved Policy BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (1998) which seeks to ensure that new development within residential areas complements or improves the amenity and character of the area. Furthermore, no conflict arises with saved Policy OE1 of the UDP which states that planning permission will not normally be granted for uses and associated structures which are, or are likely to become, detrimental to the character or amenities of surrounding properties or the area generally.
10. Moreover, no conflict arises with the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Layouts'

which, amongst other things, seeks to achieve high quality development schemes which acknowledge the local distinctiveness of the area.

Other matters

11. One representation has been received from the occupants of the adjacent Church which states that the proposed amenity area is not accurate, as it does not show the correct angled boundary line between both properties. However, the legal boundary of the appeal site is a private matter and is, therefore, not within the remit of my Decision.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit (1) I have imposed a condition (2) requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans in order to ensure certainty. A conditions (3) relating to hard and soft landscaping is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
13. A condition relating to the access (7) is necessary in the interests of highway safety and a condition relating to cycle storage (6) is necessary to ensure the provision of sustainable transport options. I have imposed a condition (4) requiring details of facilities for the screening of refuse bins in the interests of character and appearance and the living conditions of surrounding occupiers.
14. Finally I have attached a condition (5) relating to sound proofing to ensure that the living conditions of the occupiers of the host property and future occupiers of the proposed property are protected.
15. The Council has suggested a condition requiring that the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the proposal should match those used in the existing building, however, no alterations are proposed to the external surfaces of the building subject of the appeal and consequently this condition would be unnecessary.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons stated above and taking all other considerations into account, the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Caroline Mulloy

INSPECTOR

Schedule

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 the following approved plans: Location Map; drawing number 3589/01.
- 3) No development shall take place until a landscape scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority which shall include:

Details of soft landscaping:

- i) Planting plans (at not less than a scale of 1:100)
- ii) Written specification of planting and cultivation works to be undertaken;
- iii) Schedule of plants giving species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate;

Details of hard landscaping:

- iv) Details of refuse storage (including elevations if appropriate);
- v) Details of cycle storage (including elevations if appropriate);
- vi) Means of enclosure/boundary treatments (including elevations if appropriate);
- vii) Car parking layouts (including demonstration that 5% of all parking spaces are served by electrical charging points);
- viii) Details of hard surfacing materials;
- ix) External lighting;
- x) Other structures (such as play equipment and furniture);
- xi) Details of the inclusion of living walls and roofs;

Living roofs and walls:

- xii) Details of the inclusion of living walls and roofs:
- xiii) Justification as to why no part of the development can include living walls and roofs.

Details of Landscape Maintenance:

- xiv) Landscape maintenance schedule for a minimum period of 5 years.
- xv) Proposals for the replacement of any tree, shrub, or area of surfacing/seeding within the landscaping scheme which dies or in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority becomes seriously damaged or diseased.

Schedule for Implementation

Other:

- xvi) Existing and proposed functional services above and below ground;
- xvii) Proposed finishing levels or contours.

- The landscaping scheme shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details and maintained thereafter.
- 4) No details shall take place until details of facilities to be provided for the screened storage of refuse bins within the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. No part of the development shall be occupied until the facilities have been provided in accordance with the approved details thereafter the facilities shall be permanently retained.
 - 5) Within 3 months of the date of this approval, details of a sound proofing scheme, certified or to the certifiable standards of the Association of Noise Consultants (ANC) or UK Accreditation Services (UKAS), between each floors shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval within 3 months of the date of this permission and implemented within 6 months of the date of this permission.
 - 6) No development should take place until details of covered and secured cycle storage have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the development and thereafter permanently retained.
 - 7) The access for the proposed car parking shall be provided with those parts of 2.4m x 2.4m pedestrian visibility splays which can be accommodated within the site in both directions and shall be maintained free of all obstacles to the visibility between heights of 0.6m and 2m above the level of the adjoining carriageway.