

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: 20 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3158354

59 Chelston Road, Hillingdon, Ruislip, HA4 9SA

- 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 Ms C White against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 27273/APP/2016/1588, dated 25 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two-storey side and rear extension at 59 Chelston Road, Hillingdon, Ruislip, HA4 9SA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 27273/APP/2016/1588, dated 25 April 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 (1:1250) and Drg Nos 2016/12/P01, 2016/12/P02, 2016/12/P03, 2016/12/P04 A, 2016/12/P05 A and 2016/12/P06 A.
 - 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.

Procedural Matters

2. The application was made in the name of Ms Catherine White. The appeal form gave the name of the appellant as "*Mrs Caroline Whitew*". The appellant's agent has since confirmed that the applicant and appellant are one and the same and that the first name on the appeal form was given by mistake and that the spelling of the appellant's second name was a typographical error.
-

3. The application was amended through the submission of revised plans, Drg Nos 2016/12/P04 A, 2016/12/P05 A and 2016/12/P06 A, upon which I have relied.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed side extension upon the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is an end of terrace, two-storey dwelling located within a residential area comprising properties of similar age and appearance. The proposal is to project the hipped roof form of the dwelling sideways with a two-storey extension that would project to a depth of 3.6m to the rear, wrapping partially around the rear elevation of the original dwelling and infilling the remaining space to the rear and up to the shared boundary with the attached neighbour at No 61 with a single-storey extension to an equivalent depth.
6. Policy BE22 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (LP): Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and Paragraph 5.1 of the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document - Residential Extensions both require all residential extensions and buildings of two or more storeys in height to be set back a minimum of 1m from the side boundary of the property for the full height of the building. The LP and HDAS both explain that the reason for this is to protect the character and appearance of the street scene and the gaps between properties in order to prevent houses from combining visually to form a terraced appearance.
7. In this case the side extension would be set away from the plot's side boundary by 250mm which is well below the distance normally required. However, there is a communal gated alley that runs between Nos 57 and 59, providing pedestrian access to the rear of the terraces along Chelston Road. This measures approximately 1m wide. Therefore, whilst not within the confines of the appeal site, a gap would nevertheless remain between the extension and the side boundary of the neighbouring property in excess of the Council's normal requirement.
8. Although No 57 has previously extended to the side at two-storey and right up to its side boundary adjacent to the alley, sufficient space between both properties would be retained in order to ensure that they would not appear overly cramped within the street scene, with each terraced row clearly distinguishable and separated from each other. I therefore find that whilst there would be a technical breach of Policy BE22 there would no harm to the character or appearance of the street scene and as such no conflict with its specific aims and objectives. Neither would there be conflict with Policy BE1: *Built Environment* of the LP: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) or with LP Part Two Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 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.

Other Matters

9. I have had regard to concern from the neighbouring occupiers at No 61 that the proposal would result in a loss of light to a ground floor kitchen/dining area and first floor bedroom. However, the depth of the single-storey addition would comply with the Council's guidelines within the HDAS for such additions for a terraced house on a plot of this size, as would the two-storey rear extension by not extending beyond a 45-degree line of sight taken from the neighbour's nearest first floor window. In the absence of any substantive evidence to demonstrate otherwise I have no reason to consider that the proposal would impact upon levels of daylight to a degree that would be significant, this despite the presence of a single-storey addition to the opposite neighbour at No 63, which I have noted. The need or otherwise for a hedge along the boundary between both properties to be pruned does not alter my findings that the proposal would not be harmful to the living conditions at No 61.

Conditions

10. 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

11. For the reasons given, I conclude that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of the street scene. Therefore, and in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, the appeal succeeds.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR