



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 April 2021

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3264097

14 Courtlands Close, Ruislip, HA4 8AX

- 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 Neelish Dawett against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 67466/APP/2020/2567, dated 15 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is a part single storey and part two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and garage conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part single storey and part two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and garage conversion at 14 Courtlands Close, Ruislip, HA4 8AX in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 67466/APP/2020/2567 dated 15 August 2020 and in accordance with 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: 1823/05; and 1823/06.
 - 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 Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling with a gable end pitched roof and an attached double garage to the side.
 4. The appeal property is located in a residential area characterised by the presence of detached dwellings set back from the road behind short gardens and/or parking areas and with longer gardens to the rear. There are small gaps
-

between dwellings and in this location, Courtlands Close slopes from east to west, providing for some distant views to the west towards trees.

5. Taking all of the above features into account, the area has a green and spacious character.
6. The Council considers the single storey element of the proposal to be acceptable. The proposed development would also include a two storey extension to the side. This would be of modest proportions, narrow in width, set back from the front elevation and set back from the rear elevation.
7. Further to the above, the proposed first floor extension would be set in from the ground floor extension below, which itself would be partly set in from the shared boundary with No 12 Courtlands Close. Consequently, whilst the appeal property would extend slightly to the side at first floor level, the proposed development has been designed in such a way that it would retain a significant gap at first floor height between the appeal property and its neighbour.
8. During my site visit I observed that, within this generally spacious area, dwellings themselves tend to be sited close together but that the existence of small gaps between dwellings maintains a sense of space and prevents any notable "terracing" or "cramped" effect. Taking the above into account, I find that the modest first storey side extension would not close the gap between the appeal property and its neighbour to the east, No 12, to any significant degree.
9. Furthermore, due to local topography, the appeal property sits notably lower than No 14 and this factor, combined with the retention of a gap between the properties would result in the proposal retaining the area's spacious qualities. Rather than result in cramped over-development, as suggested by the Council, I find that the proposal would provide useful additional internal space in a manner carefully designed to appear entirely in keeping with the surrounding area.
10. Taking all of this into account, I find that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposed development would not be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework or to Local Plan¹ Policy BE1, or to Development Management² Policies DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Conditions

11. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against the tests set out in Paragraph 55 of the Framework. A condition specifying the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
12. A condition requiring materials to match those of the existing house is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the host property and wider area.

¹ Reference: Hillingdon Local Plan Part One – Strategic Policies (2012).

² Reference: Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020).

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal succeeds.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR