

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2017

by Michael Moffoot DipTP MRTPI DipMgt MCMI

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

Decision date: 7th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3162129

36 Eversley Crescent, Ruislip HA4 6DD

- 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 Cox against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref: 64546/APP/2016/2342, dated 16 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is conversion of existing garage with new front bay window and pitched dummy roof section with new flat roof and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for conversion of existing garage with new front bay window and pitched dummy roof section with new flat roof and side extension at 36 Eversley Crescent, Ruislip HA4 6DD in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 64546/APP/2016/2342, dated 16 June 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing no. 101 dated 27.06.16.

Preliminary Matter

2. There is no dispute between the parties as to the acceptability of the proposed side extension which would be to the rear of the existing garage. I am satisfied that this aspect of the proposal would cause no material harm and would not conflict with any development plan policies I have been referred to. I shall therefore confine my detailed considerations to the proposed front extension.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.
-

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located near to the junction of Eversley Crescent and Shenley Avenue. It includes a semi-detached, two-storey dwelling with a full height bay and a porch to the front, a garage to the side and a single-storey extension and roof dormer to the rear. The proposed front extension comprises a bay window to the front of the existing garage, which is to be converted to a playroom. The scheme includes continuation of the existing lean-to porch roof over the new bay.
5. Housing in the vicinity of the site includes bungalows and two-storey detached and semi-detached dwellings. Many have been altered and extended, including those examples referred to by the appellants in support of their case.
6. Paragraph 8.1 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: *Residential Extensions*¹ (SPD) advises that front extensions do not only affect the character and appearance of the building itself but also the street scene, and those that extend across the entire frontage will normally be refused. Paragraph 8.2 states that where a porch is combined with a garage conversion it may be integrated with a forward extension of the garage not exceeding 1m.
7. In this case the proposed bay would marginally exceed this threshold and, in conjunction with the existing bay and porch, would effectively result in an extension across the entire frontage of the property. However, the new bay window would be curved such that each end would be set back from the frontage. This would provide a discernible break to the extended frontage and reduce the visual impact of this modestly sized bay. As such, it would be a subordinate addition to the house. Furthermore, I saw similar extensions in the locality, including bay windows to neighbouring dwellings. The proposal would therefore accord with paragraph 8.3 of the SPD which states that front bay windows will only be allowed where, amongst other things, they are an established and original characteristic of neighbouring properties.
8. The Council also submits that the proposal would unbalance the semi-detached pair of dwellings. However, the symmetry of the pair has already been significantly compromised by the addition of a vertical gable extension to the roof of the appeal property which contrasts starkly with the hipped roof of the attached dwelling. Moreover, the neighbouring dwelling has a box dormer on the roof hip which further disrupts the symmetry of the pair. In these circumstances, I consider that no additional harm would arise as a result of the proposal.
9. Drawing these findings together, I conclude that the proposed development would not materially harm the character and appearance of the area. There would be no conflict with Policy BE1 of the Local Plan (Part 1)² which, amongst other things, seeks high quality design that enhances the local distinctiveness of the area and contributes to a sense of place. The proposal would not be contrary to those parts of saved policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Local Plan (Part 2)³ which require new development, including extensions, to harmonise

¹ Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document: *Residential Extensions* (2008)

² Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012)

³ Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Saved UDP Policies (2012)

with the existing building and street scene in order to complement or improve the amenity and character of the area.

10. Turning to conditions, I shall require the use of matching materials in the interests of visual amenity. To provide certainty I shall impose a condition specifying the approved drawings.
11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposal is acceptable and the appeal should succeed.

Michael Moffoot

Inspector