

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/16/3159012

54 Crosier Way, Ruislip, HA4 6HF

- 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 Peter Craigie against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 54824/APP/2016/1791, dated 13 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing conservatory and the erection of a single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing conservatory and the erection of a single-storey rear extension at 54 Crosier Way, Ruislip, HA4 6HF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 54824/APP/2016/1791, dated 13 May 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: Drg Nos 16008/01 Rev A, 16008/02 Rev A and 16008/03 Rev 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.

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 56 Crosier Way with particular regard to visual impact and light.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow with an original projection across part of its rear elevation with a hipped roof over and positioned away
-

from the shared side boundary with No 56. A similar arrangement is mirrored by No 56. The appeal property has previously been modified with its side hipped roof extended to create a gable; a rear dormer extension added; and a conservatory attached to the original rear projection. The proposal is to remove the conservatory and to build a 6m deep single-storey extension across the full width of the property, engulfing the original projection.

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 semi-detached dwelling on a 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 by some margin. 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 Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) or with those 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.

Living Conditions at 56 Crosier Way

6. There is an existing approximate 2m high close boarded fence along the common boundary between Nos 54 and 56. The rear extension is designed with a flat roof but its edge adjacent to No 56 would be chamfered so as to pitch down to an eaves height of just 2.2m along its flank wall. This would not be so significantly taller than the existing boundary enclosure as to make it appear a visually dominant or overbearing addition when seen from the curtilage of No 56, including in the outlook from its rear facing living space.
7. The rear elevation of No 56 faces roughly north. There would therefore be no direct sunlight to the rear of this property that would be affected. Whilst there may be some diminution of daylight to the rear of No 56, this would not be significant and the outlook from the rear facing window would remain open and reasonably expansive over its own fairly long garden.
8. In addition, I note the absence of any objection from the adjoining occupiers, which I consider to be significant in light of the temporary provisions until May

2019 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 insofar as it conveys certain permitted development rights for development within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse.

9. When all of this is considered, I am satisfied that the proposal would have no impact upon the living conditions at No 56 that would be significant. There would be no harm in terms of overshadowing, visual intrusion or loss of light and as a consequence there would be no conflict with the aims and objectives of Saved UDP Policies BE19, BE20 or BE21 insofar as these all seek to safeguard the residential amenities of existing properties.

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.

Conclusions

11. 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 56 Crosier Way. Therefore, and in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, the appeal succeeds.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR