



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: 8 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3230190 41 Deane Way, Ruislip HA4 8SX

- 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 H Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 66320/APP/2019/721, dated 28 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of attached side extension and rear outbuildings with new part single/part double storey front, side and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of attached side extension and rear outbuildings with new part single/part double storey front, side and rear extensions at 41 Deane Way, Ruislip HA4 8SX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 66320/APP/2019/721, dated 28 February 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: DW41-001; DW41-002; DW41-003; DW41-004; DW41-005; DW41-102 Rev A; DW41-103 Rev A; DW41-104 Rev A; DW41-105 Rev A and DW41-106 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.

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 an altered semi-detached dwelling situated within a primarily residential area of similar types of dwellings but of varying designs. Along Deane Way, the streetscene is characterised by semi-detached dwellings which are set back from the footways to the rear of front gardens which are landscaped and used for parking. To the side of most of these dwellings are single storey garages and a first floor level there is commonly a gap between the side elevations of each pair of semi-detached dwellings.

4. In a limited number of cases, a first floor side additions have been added to dwellings. Where such additions have been erected there are variations in design with some set back from the front elevation and shared side boundary whereas other possess the same footprint as the original garage below. No details of the planning circumstances of these extended dwellings have been provided, in particular whether a proposal was assessed against Policy BE22 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Saved UDP (LP) and the *Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions* (HDAS). Although their contribution to the character and appearance of the streetscene has been noted, limited weight is given to these other schemes in the determination of this appeal.
5. The proposed development includes a number of extensions but the Council's objection is to what would be a 2-storey side addition which would partially utilise the footprint of the original garage at ground floor level. The single storey flank wall of the original garage, now used as habitable accommodation, is adjacent to the shared boundary with 39 Deane Way. This would remain the case.
6. LP Policy BE22 identifies that residential extensions of 2 or more storeys should be set back a minimum of 1 metre from the side boundary. The explanatory text refers to proposals adding a second storey to a pre-existing single storey extension will normally be unacceptable if a single storey element is within 1 metre of the boundary. The HDAS guidance also identifies that if there is an existing single storey side extension within 1 metre of the shared boundary then a first floor extension should be set in a minimum of 1.5 metres.
7. As a whole, the proposed 2-storey side addition would not be set back from the shared boundary by a metre. Instead, only a 1 metre set back would be provided at first floor level. This distance is less than the 1.5 metres sought by the HDAS where there is already a single storey side addition.
8. The purpose of LP Policy BE22 and the HDAS is to maintain a sufficient gap to the shared boundary to protect the character and appearance of streets by preserving the visually open gaps between properties. Gaps are also sought to prevent dwellings from coalescing visually to form a terraced appearance which would otherwise be uncharacteristic of the surrounding area. However, the physical separation distances identified by the Council cannot take into account the detailed circumstances of all proposals.
9. In this case, even if an extension was erected at No. 39, there would be a sufficient gap between the property and the neighbouring dwelling to avoid the potential for the appearance of either terracing or a cramped form of development within the streetscene. The integration of the modest width of the first floor element into the streetscene would be assisted by its setting back from the front elevation, the proposed ground floor porch extension which would increase the perceived set back distance, the lower ridge height when compared to the host property and the pitched roof sloping away from the shared boundary.
10. 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, LP Policies BE13, BE15, BE19 and BE22 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

11. 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