The Planning Inspectorate

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2019

**by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date:9 August 2019**

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3230178**
**35A The Chase, Eastcote HA5 1SJ**

- 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 Lisa Behzadi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 3444/APP/2019/985, dated 21 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 May 2019.
- The development proposed is the erection of a single storey side extension.

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey side extension at 35A The Chase, Eastcote HA5 1SJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3444/APP/2019/985, dated 21 March 2019, 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: Location Plan and 4132/02.

   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. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the streetscene.

## Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow located on a corner plot at road junction created by a spur of The Chase which extends northwards. The property is situated within a predominantly residential area comprising and mix of dwellings. There is also a complex of apartments, Missouri Court, fronting the spur road. By reasons of variations in siting, orientation and the types of properties, there is no obvious building line along the spur road of the type referred to in the *Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions* (HDAS).

4. At junctions within the surrounding area there are variations in the relationship of between the side elevations buildings and the roads. In some cases the side

elevations are set back from the footways but in other cases the flank walls are sited close to the boundaries with the footways. Examples of a close relationship of a side elevation to the footway include 37 The Chase and 30 Bridle Road. Significant open spaces to the side of buildings at road junctions are not a predominant characteristic of the surrounding area.

5. The proposed development includes the erection of a single storey side extension to the property which would occupy the site of an existing conservatory and part of the garden between the bungalow's flank wall and the boundary with the spur road. This boundary is currently defined by a close boarded wooden fence circa 1.8 metres in height above which is vegetation. The overall height of the boundary is around 2 metres. The siting and size of the appeal scheme would bring part of the extension close to this boundary and part of the roof would be visible above the fence.

6. By reason of setting back from the front elevation, height and width, when viewed from around the junction the proposed extension would appear a subservient addition to the property. The low height and staggered form of the proposed extension, combined with the existing boundary adjacent to the footway, means that it would not be a visually dominant or conspicuous form of development that would materially harm the character and appearance of the streetscene around the junction. Visually, as is the current situation, the property's predominant feature would remain the pitched roof of the existing property which projects well above the boundary.

7. There would be no projection of the appeal scheme forward of an obvious building line along the spur road. Although sited closer to the boundary with the spur road, the scale of the enlarged property and the size of the curtilage would neither result in the overdevelopment of this plot nor the appearance of a cramped form of development. The appearance of the openness of the area around the junction would be maintained as sought by the HDAS.

8. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene and, as such, it would not conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies and Policies BE13, BE15, and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Saved UDP and the HDAS. Amongst other matters these policies include reference to promoting high quality design for all developments and for both developments and residential extensions to take into account the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

**Conditions**

9. The Council has suggested several conditions in the event this appeal succeeds which have been assessed against the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. For reason of clarity, it is appropriate for the proposed development to be erected in accordance with the approved drawings. To assist with the assimilation of the appeal scheme into the streetscene a condition requiring any external materials to match the host property is also necessary. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be allowed.

*D J Barnes*

INSPECTOR