
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2017

by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3166215

37 Coleridge Drive, Eastcote, Ruislip HA4 8GL

- 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 Mrs Lavanya Selvarajah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 72153/APP/2016/3134, dated 7 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as building a 3m single storey extension with pitched roof and 2 rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for building a 3m single storey extension with pitched roof and 2 rooflights at 37 Coleridge Drive, Eastcote, Ruislip HA4 8GL in accordance with the terms of application Ref 72153/APP/2016/3134, dated 7 October 2016 and in accordance with the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: DWG no: LS-001 Existing Site and Block Plan; DWG no: LS-004 Proposed Site and Block Plan; DWG no: LS-005 Proposed plans; DWG no: LS-006 Rev A Proposed Elevations.
 - 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 Issue

2. The main issue in this case is whether or not a good standard of amenity would be provided for the existing and future occupiers of the dwelling, having particular regard to the size of the external amenity space.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within the southern portion of the former RAF Eastcote site. It has an enclosed rear garden, largely laid to lawn with a small patio area, and a shed in the bottom corner. The proposal is for a single storey rear extension.
-

4. Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies (LP) requires new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment. Amongst other matters, high quality design which enhances the local distinctiveness of the area is sought. Saved Policies BE13 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (adopted 1998) Saved Policies (UDP) have similar objectives and require development to harmonise with the existing street scene and compliment or improve the amenity and character of an area. UDP Policy BE15 requires extensions to harmonise with the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the original building.
5. Whilst pre-dating the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), these policies broadly accord with its core planning principles to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.
6. The Council has not raised concerns in respect of the design of the proposed extension. From my observations, I have no reason to reach a contrary view. There would be no conflict with the aims of LP Policy BE1, or UDP Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 in this regard.
7. The Council is however concerned that the garden area that would remain once the extension had been constructed would not be adequate for the occupiers of the property. Saved Policy BE23 of the UDP requires that extensions to dwellings should maintain usable, external amenity space which is sufficient to protect the amenity of both the occupants of the host property and surrounding buildings.
8. Garden space standards are set out in the Hillingdon Design and Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions (SPD). For 4 bedroom dwellings, the SPD requires a garden space of at least 100 square metres; for 3 bedroom dwellings, a minimum of 60 square metres is required. The planning application drawings indicate that the property has 3 bedrooms and a study. Whilst noting this, a future occupier could use the study as a bedroom. I have therefore considered the proposal on the basis that the dwelling has 4 bedrooms.
9. The Council has calculated that following the construction of the extension, the remaining garden area would be approximately 42 square metres. This would be in conflict with the standards set out in the SPD. However, on the basis of this calculation and the size of the new extension, it would appear that the existing garden space is less than the standards set out in the SPD. It is therefore reasonable to assume that when the Council granted planning permission for the host property, it considered that the size of the garden space was acceptable for a dwelling of this size.
10. The new extension would be modest in size. It would extend from the rear of the property by 3 metres and cover its width. I find that this would result in a small reduction in garden area. Sufficient garden space to the rear of the property would remain to allow the occupiers to have a patio and lawned area. The remaining area would be large enough for retaining the existing garden shed, having an outdoor seating and table area, space for play equipment and other domestic features.

11. In light of the foregoing, I conclude that a good standard of outdoor amenity would result to the existing and future occupiers of the property. The proposal would not result in the overdevelopment of the site. It is also noted that the increase in size of the living accommodation would provide more flexible living conditions to the occupiers of the property. This would no doubt result in an increase in their enjoyment of their home which would accord with the Framework's core planning principle to improve the places in which people live their lives. I therefore find that there would be no conflict with the amenity objectives of saved UDP Policies BE19 and BE23, or the Framework.
12. In determining the planning application the Council made reference to its Hillingdon Design and Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Layouts. This document is not relevant to the appeal proposal as it relates to new residential layouts as opposed to extensions. It has therefore had no bearing on my consideration of the appeal proposal.

Conditions

13. The Council has suggested a number of conditions it would wish to see imposed in the event that the appeal was successful. A condition is necessary requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition is also necessary to ensure that the materials used for the proposed extension match the existing building.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

R C Kirby

INSPECTOR