



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/17/3167568

15 St Lawrence Drive, Eastcote, Pinner, HA5 2RL

- 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 Kenneth Harrop against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 45169/APP/2016/124 was refused by notice dated 28 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of two storey side and front additions and change to rear ground floor doors.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for the erection of two storey side and front additions and change to rear ground floor doors at 15 St Lawrence Drive, Eastcote, Pinner, HA5 2RL, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 45169/APP/2016/124, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: location map, ground floor proposed scale 1:100, and drawing nos. 15/03/01 REV E, 15/08/01.
 - 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.
 - 4) Before the first occupation of the extensions hereby permitted the first floor window in the flank wall (stairway) facing no. 11 St Lawrence Drive shall be fitted with obscured glazing, and the first floor flank wall window (bedroom 4) facing no. 17 St Lawrence Drive shall be fitted with obscured glazing and any part of the window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be non-opening. The windows shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed first floor side extension preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Eastcote Park Estate Conservation Area.
-

Reasons

3. This part of the conservation area is predominantly characterised by pairs of semi-detached houses set back from the street in a spacious and verdant setting. There are significant mature trees in the street scene and mature vegetation in front gardens. As indicated in the Conservation Area Appraisal, an important feature of the Estate is the setting of the houses and the views between them. For the most part the space between dwellings has been maintained with only single-storey extensions and garages at the side.
 4. The appeal dwelling is unusual in that it is a modest-sized detached house with a simple design. The proposal would extend the dwelling in a forward direction so that it aligns with the front of the dwelling at no. 17, and is slightly forward of the single-storey building at no. 11.
 5. The proposal would incorporate a part first floor, part 2-storey extension at the side above and in front of the existing garage. The first floor element would retain a gap of about 1m to the boundary with no. 17, about 0.5m less than the minimum 1.5m set-in required by the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document, Residential Extensions.
 6. There would remain a significant gap of almost 5m between the first floor elements of the 2 dwellings with the first floor element of no. 17 positioned beyond a side passageway and its own flat roofed garage. On the other side of no. 15, there are open views above and beyond the adjacent single storey building.
 7. I consider that important open spaces between the dwellings either side of no. 15 would be maintained. The enclosure of a modest part of the gap at first floor of about 2.2m between nos. 15 and 17 would appear neither cramped nor out of character in this context. The setting of the dwellings, and the spacious and verdant character of this part of the Eastcote Park Estate Conservation Area, would be preserved. Although there would be conflict with the HDAS requirement, I find that the additional 0.5m gap is not critical in this context.
 8. There would be a high quality of design compatible with the objectives of Policy BE1 of A Vision for 2026, Local Plan: Part 1, Strategic Policies. There is also no conflict with Local Plan Part 1 Policy HE1, which seeks to conserve and enhance Hillingdon's distinct and varied environment, including conservation areas.
 9. I find no conflict with the 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. The proposal would preserve those features which contribute to the special architectural and visual qualities of the conservation area in accordance with UDP Policy BE4.
 10. There would be no 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.
 11. The development plan objectives are consistent with those set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraphs 17 and 60 of the Framework seek to secure a high quality of design, and to reinforce local distinctiveness. Paragraph 132 of the Framework says that when considering the impact of a
-

proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The proposal meets the objectives of the Framework in these respects.

12. There are 2 side windows at no. 17, but these windows are small and within a garage, so there would be no material harm to the living conditions of no. 17 in respect of loss of daylight or sunlight.

13. A condition is necessary in respect of external materials to ensure a satisfactory finished appearance. There is also a condition requiring obscured glass in 2 side facing first floor windows to prevent unacceptable overlooking. Standard conditions are also necessary to cover commencement and compliance with the approved plans.

14. I have taken into account all other matters, including all the policies in the Framework, and other national planning policy and guidance, but I find none that warrant dismissal of this appeal.

Sue Glover

INSPECTOR
