



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2019

by C Osgathorp BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3232054

48 Exmouth Road, Ruislip HA4 0UG

- 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 James Manley against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 5208/APP/2019/952, dated 19 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and single storey front/side extension, involving demolition of existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and single storey front/side extension, involving demolition of existing garage at 48 Exmouth Road, Ruislip HA4 0UG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 5208/APP/2019/952, dated 19 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location plan; 48ExmouthRd/2019/01; 48ExmouthRd/2019/02 Rev A.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have used the description of development shown on the Council's decision notice and the appellant's appeal form in the banner heading because it is more precise than the description shown on the planning application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling, the street scene and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2 storey end-of-terrace dwelling that is located within a predominantly residential area. The street scene mainly consists of terraced houses which are generally designed with hipped roofs. There are examples of properties with 2 storey or single storey side extensions in the vicinity of the appeal site, including some that are positioned close to the side boundary.
5. The proposed part 2 storey, part single storey side extension would replace the existing single storey side garage which currently adjoins the side boundary with No 50 Exmouth Road. Saved Policy BE22 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (adopted 1998) ('UDP') and the guidance in Section 5.0 of the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions (2008) ('HDAS') state that residential extensions and buildings of 2 or more storeys in height should be set back a minimum of 1 metre from the side boundary of the property for the full height of the building. The supporting text to saved Policy BE22 explains that this is in order to preserve the visually open gaps between properties and prevent dwellings from coalescing visually to form a terraced appearance, uncharacteristic of the surrounding area.
6. Whilst the first floor part of the proposed side extension would be set in 1 metre from the side boundary the ground floor part would not, which is contrary to saved Policy BE22 of the UDP and guidance in the HDAS. However, in this case, the design of the first floor element, including the pitched roof design; the position 1m from the side boundary; and the set back from the main front wall, would ensure that a sufficient gap would be provided to No 50 to preserve the visual break between these neighbouring properties. Consequently, the buildings would continue to be viewed in the street scene as separate, distinct entities. Whilst the ground floor element would be close to the side boundary, a large proportion of properties in the street scene have side extensions or garages that are close to the side boundary. The proposed development would not, therefore, lead to a significant terracing effect or appear cramped or out of place in the street scene.
7. The proposed side extension would be subordinate in scale and mass to the dwelling with a ridgeline that would be noticeably lower than that of the existing dwelling. Furthermore, the proposed single storey front/side extension would extend a small distance to the front of the dwelling and, together with its modest height and simple roof design, it would not appear bulky or dominant in the street scene. The depth of the proposed rear extension would accord with the guidance in the HDAS. Moreover, the hipped roof of the first floor element of the rear extension would respect the form of the main roof and it would be set down from the ridgeline of the existing dwelling, which would achieve a subordinate appearance.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that whilst there would be some conflict with saved Policy BE22 of the UDP and guidance in the HDAS, in this case the proposed development would not cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling, the street scene or the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore accord with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (Adopted November 2012) and saved Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the UDP, which, amongst other things, requires all

new development to be designed to be appropriate to the identity and context of Hillingdon's buildings and townscapes.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. In order to maintain the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area, I have also imposed a condition requiring the external surfaces of the development to be finished in materials to match those used in the existing building.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Osgathorp

INSPECTOR