
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2017

by Robert Parker BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3155504

98 Ickenham Road, Ruislip, Hillingdon HA4 7DX

- 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 Rajesh Kalra against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 22705/APP/2016/12, dated 4 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The above description of development is taken directly from the application form. However, the Council has amended the wording on the decision notice to include reference to a two-storey side extension and first floor rear extension. Bearing in mind what is shown on the plans, this is a more accurate description of the proposed development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property lies within a street frontage of semi-detached houses. Its location at the end of the row means that there are clear views of the side and rear elevations from Clacks Lane and Harwell Close. From here the proposed development would be especially prominent. The two-storey element would be substantively similar in design to an extension that was approved in 2007 but not implemented. The Council raises no objection to this part of the scheme and I see no reason to disagree with its stance.
 5. The principal concern relates to a single storey extension which would span the rear of the proposed two-storey element and a pre-existing single storey extension. The new flat roofed structure would be 3 m deep and 3 m to the eaves. On its own it would be a relatively modest addition. However, when considered as part of the scheme as a whole, the combined depth of extensions beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling would be excessive and
-

disproportionate to the host property, to the detriment of its character and appearance.

6. Moreover, the substantial mass of the proposed extensions would be out of keeping with other dwellings in the row, none of which have been extended to anywhere near the same extent.
7. The Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2008) (SPD) advises that single storey extensions should always be designed so as to be subordinate to the main house. It states that for semi-detached properties on plots more than 5 m wide an extension up to 3.6 m deep is acceptable. However, the guidance warns that secondary extensions added to existing extensions may well result in the depth limits being exceeded and this may not be in character with the original house. It seems to me that the appeal scheme is a perfect example of this and thus I consider that it would fail to comply with the SPD guidance.
8. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (2012) and saved Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (1998). Together these policies seek high quality design which harmonises with the original building and the character of the area.

Other Matters

9. I have given careful consideration to all other issues raised by local residents, including the planning history of the site, the potential impacts on property values and neighbour relations and concerns regarding the effect on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers. However, based on the information before me, these matters would not constitute reasons to dismiss the appeal.
10. I have also had regard to the benefits to the occupants of the appeal property in terms of providing additional living accommodation. However, this does not justify the harm identified above.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Robert Parker

INSPECTOR