



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2019 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3230211

97 Torrington Road, Ruislip HA4 0AR

- 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 McDonagh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 11505/APP/2019/392, dated 3 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension at 97 Torrington Gardens, Ruislip, HA4 0AR, in accordance with the application, Ref 11505/APP/2019/392, dated 3 February 2019, 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 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: PA-01.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. During my site visit, I observed that the appeal property had been subject to a hip-to-gable roof extension, with a large dormer extension within the rear roofslope. The appeal property is therefore significantly different in appearance to how it is shown within the existing plans and elevations submitted as part of the application. Regardless, this appeal can still be determined insofar as it relates to the proposed drawings.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.
-

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached residential property situated on the corner of Torrington Road and Ashburton Road. A single-storey wraparound extension has been built to the front and western side of the property. There is a single-storey church situated on the opposite side of Ashburton Road. It is set back from the road by around 10m, lies around 20m from the side boundary of the appeal site and features a shallow pitched roof slope which slopes away from the adjacent roads. No. 89 Ashburton Road, which forms part of a terrace of five residential dwellinghouses to the north of the site, is around 25m from the rear façade of the appeal property. Given the considerable distances between the site and the nearest buildings, the surrounding area has an open nature. The proposal would be set back from the side boundary by 1m and as such it is considered that the proposed development would not have a cramped appearance.
6. In the delegated report, the Council assert that the proposal would introduce a virtually blank flank elevation which would appear oppressive from the street. However, as the proposed flank wall would be set back by 1m from the side boundary, would be set in from the face of the ground floor building and would feature a window in almost exactly the same position as shown on the existing side elevation drawing, it is considered that the proposal would not have an overly oppressive appearance.
7. The Council also state that the proposal would project beyond the return building line seen along Ashburton Road and would have a harmful impact on views along the road. However, as can be seen on the location plan, the appeal property is already sited forward of the return building line. As the return building line is already breached, it is considered that the further protrusion of the extension would have a neutral effect on the open views along Ashburton Road. Furthermore, given the distance of the appeal property from the nearest terrace on Ashburton Road, it is considered that the relationship between the appeal property and that terrace is not visually strong nor a key aspect of the character of the surrounding streetscene.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would not appear as an incongruous addition or cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It therefore complies with Policies BE1, of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012) and policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Saved UDP Policies (2012), which respectively state that the Council will require development proposals to be appropriate to the identity and context of Hillingdon's buildings and townscapes, harmonise with the existing streetscene, harmonise with the scale, form and architectural composition of proportions of the original building and complement or improve the amenity and character of the area. I also conclude that the proposal complies with the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility: Residential Extensions SPD, which states that there may be some scope for flexibility when assessing proposals for first floor side extensions where the side of the house adjoins a road.

Conditions

9. The conditions which are imposed are those which have been suggested by the Council, but with some variation in the interest of clarity and precision having

regard to the advice on imposing conditions in the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.

10. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the scheme be built in accordance with the approved plan for the avoidance of doubt. I have also required that the materials used should match those of the existing building, so as to preserve the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR