



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2019

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3234441

2 Lea Crescent, Ruislip HA4 6PP

- 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 Mrs Daniela Pinagli-Johns against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 48985/APP/2019/854, dated 11 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as "Demolition of existing side garage. Erection of a double storey side extension."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing side garage, erection of a double storey side extension at 2 Lea Crescent, Ruislip HA4 6PP, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 48985/APP/2019/854, dated 11 March 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Plan; Block Plan; Existing Ground Floor; Proposed Ground Floor; Existing First Floor; Proposed First Floor; Existing Loft Floor; Proposed Loft Floor; Existing Roof Plan; Proposed Roof Plan; Existing Front Elevation; Proposed Front Elevation; Existing Rear Elevation; Proposed Rear Elevation; Existing Side Elevation; Proposed Side Elevation; Existing Block Plan of the Site; Proposed Block Plan of the Site; Existing and Proposed Vehicular Crossover.
 - 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 Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and the effect of the proposal on highway safety with regards to access.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The surrounding area is characterised predominantly of residential properties of traditional architectural detailing. The appeal site sits on a prominent corner plot at the junction of Lea Crescent and Clyfford Road and forms part of a row of houses. There is a mix of different housing styles and sizes in the area and it is this variation which contributes positively to the character of the area.
4. The proposed extension would project forward of the front building line of Clyfford Road by approximately 3.4 metres. The appeal property does not form part of the front building line of the dwellings on Clyfford Road being on a different orientation. The proposal would have a similar arrangement to the property directly opposite which is set in close proximity to Clyfford Road. The proposal is set back from the boundary of the site which would maintain a visual gap and not appear as a dominant feature within the surrounding area or intrusive within the building line of the properties on Clyfford Road.
5. The proposed extension would not be overly large or wide and would be subordinate to the appeal property and the row of houses on Lea Crescent. Due to its design, scale and positioning, the proposal would not be an incongruous feature and would not have a detrimental effect on the street scene or the surrounding area.
6. The proposal would not be a discordant addition and would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would accord with Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan 2016, Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies 2012, Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 – Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies 2012 (UDP) and the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document Residential Layouts 2006 which seeks development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment, harmonise with the existing street scene and the original building, and complements the character of the area.

Highway safety

7. The proposals include the widening of the existing driveway in order to allow for additional parking within the site. The driveway would not extend towards the highway junction with Clyfford Road. The nearby highway junction is wide and there is good visibility, I therefore do not consider that vehicles entering and leaving the appeal site would adversely compromise the movements of pedestrians of other vehicles.
8. The Council have indicated that the proposed footpath crossover width would exceed the standard stated in the London Borough of Hillingdon Domestic Vehicle Footway Crossover Policy 2019 (DVFCP). Nevertheless, the proposed driveway would accord with the DVFCP safety considerations as the proposed crossover would ensure adequate visibility is maintained to allow safe access to the property, pedestrians would not be obstructed and the crossover would not extend any closer to the highway junction.
9. I therefore find that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on highway safety with regards to the access. The proposal would comply with Policies AM2, AM7 and AM14 of the UDP and the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility

Statement Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions 2008 which seeks development not to prejudice highway or pedestrian safety.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition relating to materials in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR