



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 October 2020

by Rebecca Thomas MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04/11/2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3250595

129 Exmouth Road Ruislip HA4 0UH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr P Sohi against the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 12922/APP/2020/19, dated 6 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is Part two storey, part single storey, part first floor side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Part two storey, part single storey, part first floor side/rear extension at 129 Exmouth Road Ruislip HA4 0UH in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 12922/APP/2020/19, dated 6 January 2020, 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 plan: 129ER/P100.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural matter

2. The Council altered the description of development from "two storey side and rear wrap around extension" to "Part two storey, part single storey, part first floor side/rear extension". This is also the description used by the appellant on the appeal form. I consider this to be a more accurate description of the appeal proposals and I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed two storey side extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within a residential street, characterised by terraces of two storey dwellings set back from the road. There are a number of

alterations to properties throughout Exmouth Road and these vary in appearance and height.

5. The appeal property is the end dwelling of four terraced properties. It has a clay tiled roof with a recessed front door. There is a single garage building attached and it is this garage that would be replaced by the proposed two storey extension, which would wrap around to the rear of the house to provide a single storey and two storey extension. The extension as seen from the street would have two storeys, with the ground floor being flush with the existing front elevation, and the first floor stepped back. The roof lines would follow the original, providing a similar hipped gable, and the ground floor would have a canopy treatment similar to the adjacent property at number 127 Exmouth Road.
6. Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan¹ ("the Local Plan") sets out at part C) criteria for side extensions, including setting out specific expectations regarding sizes and set back distance requirements in order to maintain adequate visual separation and views between houses.
7. The first floor element of the proposed development would retain a 1 metre gap from the side boundary and would be set back from the principal front elevation by 1 metre. Whilst this would not be the case for the ground floor element, the set back at first floor level would provide sufficient gap between the appeal site and number 127. The proposed hipped roof with the slope away from the neighbouring property ensures that the distinction between properties would be retained. Whilst the proposed development would not be strictly in accordance with the Local Plan criteria, the extension would be clearly subservient to the existing dwelling through a reduced ridgeline and the set-backs at the first floor. Added to this, the width would be restricted so as not to dominate the original house.
8. Taking into account the above, the proposed development would not result in a cramped form of development or unacceptable closing of the gap between properties. I have also had regard to the number of properties in the immediate area that have similar side extensions that are as close to their boundaries, and as such the development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the streetscene. I therefore find that the proposal would take into account the plot widths and gaps between buildings, established street patterns, rooflines and streetscape rhythms and as such accords with Policy DMHB11.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has drawn my attention to a similar appeal decision (APP/R5510/D/19/3232054), although I have not been provided with the full details of this decision. Nonetheless, I am satisfied that this does not prejudice my decision in this instance.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard timescale for implementation condition, it is necessary to attach a condition to confirm the approved drawings in the interests of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the

¹ London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies (January 2020)

area, I have also imposed a condition to ensure that the external surfaces materials would match the existing.

Conclusion

11. I have found that there is no harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling nor to the local area. I therefore conclude that, subject to the above conditions, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be allowed.

Rebecca Thomas

INSPECTOR