



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 March 2017

by Sue Glover BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3167585

51 Linden Avenue, Ruislip, HA4 8TZ

- 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 Jahn Hingst against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 68699/APP/2016/3799 was refused by notice dated 8 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is the raising of the roof and installation of a rear dormer and front and side roof lights to allow for the conversion of the roof space to habitable use, and a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the first floor side extension on the character and appearance of the street scene and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. This part of the street is characterised by 2-storey terraces positioned quite close to the street so that the area has an urban, compact feel. The compact character is mitigated to an extent by the spaces between terraces especially at first floor level.
 4. The gaps between the terraces vary in size with some wider than others. Within many of the gaps there is a narrow side path providing rear access. There are single storey extensions and garages at the side but a smaller number of examples of 2-storey extensions.
 5. No. 51 has a modest sized, single storey extension to the side boundary as does the adjacent end of terrace house at no. 53. A narrow side pathway about 1.05m in width separates the 2 dwellings.
 6. The proposed first floor extension at no. 51 would narrow the gap between terraces at first floor level. It would appear especially prominent on account of the position of no. 51 slightly closer to the street than no. 53. The gap would also appear significantly reduced as the first floor extension would be flush with the front wall of no. 51 rather than being set back, and without any set back from the side boundary. Whilst there would be matching materials, windows,
-

and roof design, the position and prominence of the proposed first floor side extension would significantly reduce the visual separation of the 2 terraces.

7. In this respect, there would not be a high quality of design or an enhancement of local distinctiveness contrary to Policy BE1 of A Vision for 2026, Local Plan: Part 1, Strategic Policies. There would be material harm to the character and appearance of the street scene and the surrounding area.
8. I also find conflict with saved London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19, which amongst other things require development to harmonise with the street scene and design of the original building and to complement or improve the amenity and character of the area. There would be conflict with UDP Policy BE22 that states that residential extensions of two or more storeys in height should be set back a minimum of 1m from the side boundary of the property.
9. In respect of the proposals to raise the roof ridge by about 0.25m, and the rear dormer and roof lights, the Council raises no objection to these elements of the proposal. Given the variation in roof heights within the terrace and the modest scale of the proposed dormer, I find no material harm to character and appearance from these aspects of the proposal.
10. The development plan policies are compatible with paragraphs 17 and 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework that seek to secure a high quality of design, and to reinforce local distinctiveness. The proposed side extension does not meet the objectives of the Framework in these respects.
11. The proposed side extension is contrary to design objectives set out in the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions. HDAS recommends that first floor extensions are set in 1.5m from side boundaries where the ground floor is less than 1m from the boundary.
12. The appellants have raised the matter of 2 other appeal decisions for extensions at the sides of nos. 76 and 93 Linden Avenue. Whilst there are some similarities there are also material differences in circumstances in these other cases compared with this appeal proposal. In the case of no. 76, the adjacent garage is set well back. In respect of no. 93, the adjacent house at no. 91 has a side gate set back from the front and no side extension. I have considered this proposal on its own individual merits and have reached differing conclusions.
13. Some nearby residents have raised matters about the potential for damage to property and blocked pathways, but these matters are not material to my decision. I have taken into account all other matters, including all the policies in the Framework and other national planning policy and guidance. The appeal however does not succeed.

Sue Glover

INSPECTOR
