

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2016

by Roy Merrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3155730

104 Torrington Road, Ruislip, Hillingdon HA4 0AU

- 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 & Mrs Thomas against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 7/321/APP/2016/1213, dated 24 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side and single storey rear extension at 104 Torrington Road, Ruislip, Hillingdon HA4 0AU in accordance with the application Ref 7/321/APP/2016/1213, dated 24 March 2016 and 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 the following approved plans: 3555/01; 3555/02A.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 4) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until surface water drainage works shall have been implemented in accordance with details that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Before any details are submitted to the local planning authority an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system, having regard to Defra's non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (or any subsequent version), and the results of the assessment shall have been provided to the local planning authority. Where a sustainable drainage scheme is to be provided, the submitted details shall:
provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving
-

groundwater and/or surface waters;
provide, a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the main dwelling and wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is part of a relatively straight residential street, predominantly comprising short terraces of two storey dwellings. The dwellings are characterised by ground and first floor projecting bay windows with gable roof features above and hipped main roofs to the terrace. The similarity in the design, proportion and position of the fenestration results in a strong sense of visual rhythm along both sides of the street.
4. The appeal site itself is an end terrace dwelling, the side of which is immediately adjacent to an access track. The proposed side extension would take the place of an existing ground level garage, to be demolished. Therefore whilst the proposal would enclose open space within the street scene, this would be at upper floor level only. Furthermore it would not remove the gap separating the adjacent terrace because the access track would remain in place. The maintenance of this gap in the street scene would avoid the sense of the development appearing cramped and the site over-developed.
5. Having visited the site and surrounding area, I do not concur with the Council that the openness between gaps in terraces at upper storey level is a strong defining characteristic of the area. From my visit I noted that similar first floor side extensions appear to have been added at 57 and 55 Torrington Road. These properties are also separated by an access road. The dwelling at 192 Victoria Road has also been similarly extended adjacent to a side road.
6. I did note several cases of terraces having been extended to the side at ground level only, therefore maintaining a gap at upper storey level. However, in those cases an intervening side access road, which by its nature would have the benefit of preserving the gap between terraces, was absent.
7. Therefore in terms of character, I consider that the street scene is more readily identified by the visual rhythm resulting from the similarity of architecture in the dwellings situated along it as referred to above. This visual rhythm is occasionally interrupted by gaps between the terraces.
8. The scale of the proposed side extension would be subordinate to the main dwelling and in keeping with its hipped roof design. Furthermore there are no dwellings facing onto the side access road and accordingly the development would not interrupt any return building lines.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the main dwelling and wider area. It would therefore accord with Policies BE1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part One Strategic Policies 2012 and Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies 2012

insofar as they seek to promote good design that protects local character and harmonises with its surroundings. It would also, taking into account the specific context of the proposal, be consistent with the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions 2008 which seeks to maintain the openness of corner plots whilst ensuring that return building lines are not breached.

Conditions and Conclusion

10. Conditions specifying the plans and requiring details to be agreed of the materials to be used in the external surfaces of the extension are needed to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.
11. I understand that the appeal site lies within a critical drainage area. To this end, the officer's report supported the request of the drainage engineer for a condition relating to the provision of a sustainable drainage scheme. However, no such condition is suggested on the Questionnaire. In coming to a view on this, I am mindful that in critical drainage areas, even when in Flood Zone 1, a Flood Risk Assessment is usually required. No such assessment is before me. That said, the development proposed comprises minor development with only a marginal increase in building footprint. More importantly, the development would not increase the number of dwellings within the critical area. On that basis, I am satisfied that a condition simply securing the submission of drainage details, would be proportionate in this instance, in the interest of preventing any increase in risk from flooding.
12. For the above reasons and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed and planning permission be granted.

Roy Merrett

INSPECTOR