Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 September 2020 by Ben Phillips BSc MSc

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3253022
39A 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 Ebrahim Harandi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 75474/APP/2020/883, dated 11 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 May 2020.
- The development proposed is described as a second storey rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this case are the following:

• the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area; and

• the effect of the proposed extension on the living conditions of the occupants of No 41 Flamborough Road, with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons for Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling, located on Flamborough Road, which is characterised by similar terraced properties, many with various rear extensions, mostly single storey but with some two storey extensions visible from my site visit.

5. The extension proposed would add a second floor over an existing single storey rear projection. The full width extension would have a pitched roof. Given its width, the angle of the pitched roof sides would not match the hip end of the existing main roof. Consequently, the two roof planes would sit awkwardly, and the extension would overwhelm the host property and be out of keeping with its character and appearance.

6. Whilst the extension would not be visible from Flamborough Road, it would, given its height, be apparent from the access lane to the rear, briefly from Sidmouth Drive to the south and from the rear of residential properties nearby. The extension would appear as an incongruous addition on the rear of the

dwelling which would not reflect nearby extended dwellings. Accordingly, it would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area.

7. In light of the foregoing, I conclude that the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the existing property and the surrounding area, in conflict with Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) (LP) and Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012), which collectively seek, amongst other things, for development proposals to be of a high quality design and that rear extensions are subservient and in keeping with the original property.

Living Conditions

8. Both neighbouring properties have a similar single storey rear projection to the appeal property. Whilst No 39 is set slightly forward of the host property, it is evident that the proposed extension would not conflict with the 45 degree line when drawn from the nearest habitable room window of this neighbour. Its impact upon outlook would therefore be limited and given the limited depth and orientation of the proposed extension relative to No 39, it would be unlikely to result in a reduction of light levels to the degree that would make the rear rooms of this property less pleasant to use.

9. Whilst sited on the boundary with No 41, the new extension's rearward projection beyond the first floor windows of this property would be limited and would be unlikely to have an adverse impact on the current open outlook from them which is primarily down this property's rear garden. The extension would be viewed against the existing building and would not, as a result of its scale be overbearing on the outlook from the rear garden of this property, nor would it have any impact on the outlook from the rear ground floor windows of No 41 because of its position relative to them.

10. Furthermore, given the position of the extension to the rear windows and garden of No 41, there would be unlikely to be a reduction in light to these areas to the degree that would make the rooms that these windows serve or the rear garden environment les pleasant to use.

11. In light of the foregoing, it is concluded that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining properties, Nos 39 or 41 Flamborough Road. There is therefore no conflict with LP Policies DMHB 11 or DMHD 1, which, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development does not adversely impact on the amenity of adjoining or neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

12. The improvement to the living accommodation of the appellant and his family is noted, as is the potential consequent lack of need for additional property. However, there is a high probability that additional accommodation could be provided to the dwelling which does not result in harm to either the existing property or area. This matter carries limited weight in my consideration of this appeal and does not outweigh the harm identified.

13. The Appellant refers to the London Plan and 'Planning for the Future' policy paper. I have not been provided with a copy of the relevant parts of the London Plan and in terms of the policy paper, the proposal clearly conflicts with

the section quoted by the appellant, because the proposal would not result in a well-designed new home for the reasons set out above.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

R C Kirby

INSPECTOR