

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2016

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3159456

30 Redmead Road, Hayes, UB3 4AX

- 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 Muquid Ali against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 17754/APP/2016/2287, dated 13 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single-storey rear extension at 30 Redmead Road, Hayes, UB3 4AX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17754/APP/2016/2287, dated 13 June 2016, 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: Location Plan and Drg Nos 01, 02, 03 Rev C, 04 Rev C, 05 Rev C, 06 Rev C, 07 Rev C and 08 Rev C.
 - 3) 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.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, and upon the living conditions at 32 Redmead Road, with particular regard to visual impact.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is mid-terraced, two-storey dwelling located within a residential area of similar properties. There is an existing 4.3m deep, single-storey extension to the rear of the property across approximately half the width of the plot and adjacent to the side common boundary with the attached
-

neighbour at No 28. It is proposed to extend the existing addition sideways across the entire width of the plot, effectively infilling the space to the rear of the original building and adjacent to the neighbouring dwelling at No 32.

Character and Appearance

4. Paragraph 3.1 of the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document - Residential Extensions states that a single-storey rear extension should always be designed so as to appear subordinate to the original house. Paragraph 3.3 of the HDAS notes that for a terraced plot more than 5m wide an extension of up to 3.6m deep is acceptable. The extension in this case would exceed the Council's guidelines. However, the HDAS is explicitly clear that the guidelines on depth are to ensure that an extension would not protrude too far out from the rear wall of the original house so as to block daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties.
5. In terms of height and roof design the proposal would comply with HDAS paragraph 3.6. Despite its depth, I find the size and single-storey form of the extension would be of acceptable proportions and appropriately subservient to the scale and form of the original dwelling. Furthermore, due to the contained location of the extension to the rear of the property, it would be largely undetected from beyond the immediate curtilage of the appeal site. For these reasons I am satisfied that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of the area and therefore no conflict with the aims and objectives of Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), insofar as they all relate to the need to achieve high quality in design and for development to respect the scale and composition of existing buildings and to harmonise with the street scene and wider area. For these same reasons I find no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) as it relates to this matter.

Living Conditions at No 32

6. The Council correctly identifies that the existing extension to the rear of the appeal property would screen the proposed extension from having any impact upon the residential amenities at 28 Redmead Road. In finding harm to the living conditions at No 32 however no consideration appears to have been given to the existing boundary enclosure between Nos 30 and 32. There is currently a solid brick wall running along this boundary which screens any sight of the existing lean-to extension to the rear of No 32 from the appeal site. This wall projects beyond the neighbouring extension and its depth is just marginally short of the proposed extension to No 30.
7. When seen from the curtilage of No 32, including in the outlook from within its rear extension, the flank wall of the extension would appear little different to the existing boundary wall. From my observations on site it was apparent that there would be little discernible increase in height and only a marginal increase in depth. This would have no significant impact upon the living conditions at No 32 and as a consequence there would be no harm in terms of overshadowing, visual intrusion or over-dominance. There would therefore be no conflict with the aims and objectives of Saved UDP Policies BE20, BE21 and BE24 insofar as these all seek to safeguard the residential amenities of existing properties. For

these same reasons I find no conflict with the Framework as it relates to this matter.

Conditions

8. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area it is necessary to ensure that the new works are carried out in materials to match the existing.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, I conclude that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of the area and no harm to the living conditions at 32 Redmead Road. Therefore, and in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, the appeal succeeds.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR