
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 May 2017

by Geoff Underwood BA(Hons) PGDip(Urb Cons) MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 25 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3170160
157 Beverley Road, Ruislip HA4 9AP

- 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 Alex Morgan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 58293/APP/2016/3718, dated 26 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is a part single, part two storey side extension and part single, part two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part single, part two storey side extension and part single, part two storey rear extension at 157 Beverley Road, Ruislip HA4 9AP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 58293/APP/2016/3718, dated 26 September 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 16028/01 Rev A, 16028/02 Rev A, 16028/03 Rev A and 16028/04 Rev A.
 - 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.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Alex Morgan against the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect the proposed extension would have on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is situated at the end of a short terrace which is similar to those which line much of Beverley Road. The appeal proposal would extend the

property to the rear and to side at ground floor with a first floor element set back from the front and both sides of the property. The site is unusual in having an open area between its flank elevation and the property boundary whereas the majority of other end terrace properties in the vicinity have extensions which extend close to or up to the boundary, including some of two storeys in height.

5. The set back of the first floor part and its lower ridge height would make it appear subordinate to the host building as would the relatively narrow ground floor element. A gap would remain at first floor level between the proposal and the neighbouring property at 159 Beverley Road avoiding a terracing effect at this level. This would remain the case in the event that a first floor extension with a similar set back from the boundary were to be erected to the side of No 159 at some time in the future.
6. The appeal building would appear visually linked with No 159 at ground floor level as a result its close proximity to the boundary adjacent to an existing extension on that neighbouring property. However, this would not render the appeal proposal incongruous within the wider streetscape as a result of the number of other end terrace properties in the vicinity which abut their neighbours as a result of extensions. This has led to a relatively high degree of visual coalescence between the short terraces, in some cases forming an extended terraced appearance. The proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area in such a context.
7. Nevertheless, the proposal would not comply with saved UDP¹ Policy BE22's requirement that two storey extensions be set back a minimum of 1m from the side boundary for the full height of the building, an approach supported by the Council's guidance².
8. That guidance also advises that if there is an existing single storey side extension within 1m of the boundary, a first floor extension on top should be set in a minimum of 1.5m. There is no evidence to suggest that a greater than theoretical possibility exists that the appellant would construct the proposal in two phases to accord with this approach.
9. However, the proposal would avoid a terracing effect as a result of its first floor set back at the front and side. It would also be set within a streetscape context where many of the short terraces along Beverley Road have become visually linked, including some at first floor level. These are material considerations which indicate that a decision otherwise than in accordance with the development plan should be taken in this case.

Other Matters

10. The neighbours at No 155 raised concerns that the proposal would adversely affect their living conditions. However, the proposal would project along the common boundary a similar extent at ground floor to an extension which already exists at No 155. The two storey element would be set well away from that boundary and the first floor rear windows serving No 155. I do not consider that the proposal would result in a material loss of light reaching the inside of No 155 or any adverse effects on the outlook from it. Any overlooking

¹ London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan, 1998.

² Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Extensions, 2008, paragraph 5.1.

of No 155's garden from windows in the extension would be no more extensive than currently exists. I therefore do not consider that the living conditions of neighbours would be materially harmed and I note that the Council reached a similar conclusion in this respect.

Conditions

11. It is necessary to specify the approved plans as this provides certainty. It is necessary to require that external materials match the host building to preserve the character and appearance of the building and the area.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Material considerations indicate that a decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore allowed.

Geoff Underwood

INSPECTOR