
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2020

by James Taylor BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3244654

27 Flamborough Road, Ruislip HA4 0DN

- 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 Berinder Kalsi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 14241/APP/2019/2926, dated 2 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'two storey side extension involving demolition of existing garage. Single storey rear extension.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for development described as 'two storey side extension involving demolition of existing garage. Single storey rear extension' at 27 Flamborough Road, Ruislip HA4 0DN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 14241/APP/2019/2926, dated 2 September 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: 01/10, 02/10, 03/10 and 04/10.
 - 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.

Procedural matter

2. Since the Council issued its Decision Notice, the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 – Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions have been withdrawn with the adoption of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2, Development Management Policies, Adopted Version 16 January 2020 (LP2). The Council have updated their position and the appellant has had opportunity to comment in light of this material change in circumstances. I have proceeded to determine the appeal on the basis of the relevant policies of the development plan, including LP2 and the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (Adopted November 2012) (LP1).

Background and Main Issues

3. Whilst the proposal includes a single-storey rear extension, the Council have not raised issue with this element of the scheme within their decision. I have no reason to reach a contrary conclusion. Therefore, the main issues with the proposal are the effect of the two-storey side extension on:
 - i) the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area; and
 - ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of 29 Flamborough Road with particular regard to loss of light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The proposal would replace the existing single-storey garage with a two-storey extension. This would project no further forward than the existing garage at ground-floor level. At first-floor level the extension would be set-back from the ground floor and the two-storey bay window, ensuring that the bay remains the main feature of the front elevation. At roof level, the property has already converted its hipped form to a gable. The proposal would be a simple continuation of the existing ridge and eaves, maintaining the gabled form. As such, whilst not set back and slightly greater than half the width of the original first floor, the proposal would not dominate the dwelling.
5. Flamborough Road is a suburban residential street characterised by terraces of two-storey housing with a range of alterations and extensions. The area has a high degree of enclosure from the terraced form; a characteristic that has been further emphasised by the numerous examples of extensions and infill development at the end of the terraces. The remaining spaciousness of the street is generated by the housing being set-back from the road rather than those few remaining examples of visual gaps between the houses.
6. Whilst the proposal would largely infill the existing visual gap, this would be consistent with the enclosure which currently characterises the street scene. As such, whilst not set in from the side boundary by a minimum of 1 metre, the proposal would not appear cramped and the reduced visual gap would be consistent with the enclosed character of the street scene.
7. Therefore, in conclusion on the first main issue the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. As such, the proposal in this regard would not be in conflict with Policy BE1 of LP1 or Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of LP2. Furthermore, the proposal would not be in conflict with the spirit of DMHD 1 of LP2 and any technical conflict is outweighed by the specific context of the appeal site and area. These policies seek, amongst other aims, to achieve high-quality design that harmonises and integrates with the local context.

Living conditions

8. The proposed two-storey side extension would be located adjacent to the neighbouring garage to which it would modestly overlap. Moreover, save for a mid-level window on the side elevation, which appears to serve non-habitable space, the windows of No 29 would not look out towards the extension.

Additionally, No 29 benefits from a generous private rear garden. The garden has an open outlook to the east, south and north which would not be impacted by the development. As such, the two-storey side extension would not be visually intrusive, dominate, overshadow or cause loss of light to No 29's occupiers.

9. Therefore, in conclusion on this main issue the proposal would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of 29 Flamborough Road with particular regard to loss of light and outlook. As such, the proposal in this regard would not be in conflict with Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 11, and DMHB 12 of LP2. These policies seek, amongst other aims, to achieve high-quality design that ensures a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings, no unacceptable loss of outlook and no adverse impact on daylight and sunlight received by adjacent properties.

Conditions and conclusion

10. The Council have suggested a number of conditions including the standard implementation, approved plans and matching materials conditions. Such conditions are necessary in order to define the terms of the permission and protect the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, the Council have requested details of landscaping and that a proportion of the front garden remains soft landscaped in perpetuity. However, given the limited scale of the side and rear extension, within a well-established residential area, these conditions are not necessary.
11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

James Taylor

INSPECTOR