
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2017

by Stephen Hawkins MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3162271
20 Ivy Close, Eastcote, Pinner HA5 1PU

- 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 and Mrs P Warner against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 43760/APP/2016/2237, dated 8 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 3 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a proposed two storey side extension at 20 Ivy Close, Eastcote, Pinner HA5 1PU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 43760/APP/2016/2237, dated 8 June 2016, subject to 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: 101 Rev P1, 102 Rev P1, 103 Rev P1, 111 Rev P1, 112 Rev P1, and 113 Rev P1.
 - 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 appeal is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property consists of a detached dwelling occupying a spacious plot, set back from the end of a residential cul-de-sac facing a pedestrian footpath. The dwelling is similar in terms of its age, general design, siting and plot size to 19 Ivy Close (No 19) directly opposite. Otherwise, the cul-de-sac mostly comprises pairs of semi-detached dwellings of similar age and appearance, sited at various distances back from the road in well-spaced plots. Although some properties including No 19 have been substantially extended, the overall impression is one of a balanced and spacious suburban character and appearance.
-

4. The proposed extension would be of a width and depth not dissimilar to that of the existing dwelling. Apart from a small section of crown roof, the extension would have a similar roof form to the existing dwelling and it would be similar in terms of its eaves and overall height. Consequently, the extension would have a substantial overall size, height and bulk.
5. The Council's adopted 'Residential Extensions' Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) section 5 advises that amongst other matters, the width and height of a two storey side extension should be considerably less than that of the original dwelling, the width being no more than between half and two thirds of the dwelling depending on the plot size and character of the area. The overall width and height of the extension would therefore be substantially in excess of that advised in the SPD.
6. Nevertheless, due to the set back and angled position of the existing dwelling, for the most part there would be a foreshortened view of the extension from the cul-de-sac. This would significantly diminish the sense of the overall width and height of the extension in relation to that of the existing dwelling. Part of the extension would also be set back a metre from the front of the existing dwelling, further reducing the ability to appreciate its overall width and height from public viewpoints. Existing high boundary enclosures and outbuildings would tend to significantly limit views of the extension from the adjacent footpath. As a result, the overall width and height of the extension would not be readily apparent from the public realm. The architectural treatment of the front elevation of the existing dwelling including its bay windows, would continue to be more assertive in public views. Consequently, the extension would appear as a subordinate addition to the existing dwelling and the failure to follow the advice in the SPD would not result in unacceptable visual harm.
7. Due to its angled siting, the extension would not be within one metre of the side boundary at any point. For the most part, the side wall of the extension would be much further from the boundary. This would maintain a sense of space about the extended dwelling, comparing favourably with the spacing between dwellings in the rest of the cul-de-sac. It would also be consistent with advice in the SPD section 5 concerning maintaining a gap of least one metre to the side boundary.
8. Moreover, in terms of its size and general design, the extended dwelling would have a similar overall appearance to No 19, which I am given to understand has been extended at the side on two occasions, following the granting of planning permission in 1994 and 2011¹. The more recent side extension to No 19 was therefore considered against the SPD and most of the same Development Plan policies as the appeal scheme. The existence of similar development would not in itself be a good reason to allow a scheme if it had otherwise been unacceptable. However, in this instance, the similarities between the extension and the appearance of No 19 would also serve to reinforce the sense of balance which is evident in dwellings elsewhere along the street.
9. Therefore, the extension would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, the extension would accord with Policy BE1 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1-Strategic Policies, as it would improve and maintain the quality of the built environment by achieving a

¹ Council references 10598/E/94/1057 & 10598/APP/2010/2792.

high quality of design, enhancing the local distinctiveness of the area in terms of its form, scale and materials.

10. The extension would accord with saved Policy BE13 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (UDP), as its appearance would harmonise with the existing street scene. It would also accord with saved UDP Policy BE15, as the extension would harmonise with the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the original building. Further, the extension would accord with saved UDP Policy BE19, as it would complement the amenity and character of the area. The distance to the side boundary would accord with saved UDP Policy BE22. The extension would not be consistent with part of the SPD in terms of its width and height. Nonetheless, in overall terms the extension would be consistent with the SPD aims of protecting the character and appearance of the street scene and the gaps between properties.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard commencement condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans in the interests of certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring the external materials of the extension to match those of the dwelling, to ensure a harmonious appearance.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Stephen Hawkins

INSPECTOR