



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2020

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3246054

7a Cornwall Road, Ruislip HA4 6AJ

- 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 Rick Reka against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 74955/APP/2019/3214, dated 1 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as the demolition of existing garage. Double storey side extension. New insulation / render to the outside face of the entire building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issues

2. Since the application was determined Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) no longer forms part of the Development Plan. The Council has also stated that the Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions has been withdrawn. The relevant policies are therefore Policies DMHB11, DMHB18 and DMHD1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two Development Management Policies with Modifications (January 2020) (the LP).
3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and whether the appeal scheme would provide adequate living conditions of future occupiers, with particular regards to outside space.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is a triangular shaped plot in a prominent corner position at the junction of Cornwall Road and Torrington Road. The appeal property is a modest detached dwelling in an area where linked and semi-detached residential properties predominate.
5. Policies DMHB11 and DMHD 1 of the LP require new development, amongst other matters, to appear subordinate to the main dwelling and harmonise with the local context.
6. The proposed extensions are significant, incorporating considerable additional built form to the ground floor, first floor and roof. The Officers report details that "the extension would also measure 3.75m in width which would be

between half and two thirds of the main house". The submitted plans show the proposed extensions would be flush with the front elevation of the appeal property.

7. Furthermore, as a result of the size and design of the proposed extensions, the submitted plans show that the roof would be raised by approximately 0.5m and appear as a considerable addition to the existing modest dwelling. Consequently, a result of the height, width and design of the proposed extensions, the appeal scheme would not appear subordinate to the original dwelling harming the character and appearance of the area.
8. At the site visit I saw the dwelling on the opposite corner of Cornwall Road and those elsewhere on Cornwall Road and Torrington Road referred to by the appellant. I have not been provided with all of the details of these developments and the presence of these dwellings do not convince me as to the acceptability of the appeal proposal.
9. For the reasons detailed above find that the appeal scheme would harm the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policies DMHB11 and DMHD 1 of the LP.

Living conditions

10. The officer's report details that the appeal scheme would provide 45.51sqm of the 60sqm outside space required by Policy DMHB 18 of the LP. This is not disputed by the appellant. The appellant states that the proposed extension would see the "front/side garden reduced by just 2m²".
11. Therefore, while the overall short fall of outside space against the policy requirement is substantial, the actual loss of garden space resulting from the appeal scheme is small. The submitted plans show that the actual space to be lost is narrow and of limited usability for existing and future occupiers.
12. Nonetheless the appeal scheme would fail, by a substantial degree, to provide the outside space required by Policy DMHB 18 of the LP. I therefore find that the appeal scheme would not provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers, with particular regards to outside space contrary to the provisions of Policy DMHB 18 of the LP that amongst other matters seeks to ensure that future residents have access to good quality and useable private outdoor amenity space.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mark Brooker

INSPECTOR