



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 May 2021

by Rebecca McAndrew BA Hons, PG Dip Urban Design, MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3261068
18 St Edmunds Avenue, Ruislip HA4 7XW

- 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 Sam Blake against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 3255/APP/2020/1398, dated 1 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as, *'part two storey, part single storey rear extension with Juliette balcony involving demolition of existing extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 2 x rear dormers, 2 x front dormers, 7 x roof light and conversion of roof from hip to gable end with alterations to fenestration, hard standing to front, associated refuse and recycling store including rebuilding of existing garage'*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.
2. I note that the windows in the side elevation of neighbouring property, No 16 St Edmunds Avenue, are not plotted correctly on the drawings submitted in support of the appeal. I have therefore considered the appeal on the basis of the position of the windows which I observed during my site visit.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are;
 - i) The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area; and
 - ii) The effect on the living conditions of neighbours, specifically No 16, in terms loss of light and loss of outlook

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012) (HLP1SP) and Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020) (HLP2DMP) and Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework'), taken together, seek to secure good quality development which responds to local context, in terms of design, scale and existing development pattern. HLP2DMP Policy

DMHD 1 requires residential extensions to respect the original design of the host dwelling and appear subordinate in terms of width, depth and height. This policy states that rear extensions to detached properties should not exceed 4 metres in depth.

5. The appeal scheme proposes a substantial two storey rear extension which would have an awkward design at first floor level and would extend beyond the 4 metre depth limit set out in Policy DMHD 1. The overly complicated design proposes a substantial gable projection with a large flat roof crown section, along with dormers, which would adjoin this gable roof extension. Whilst the rear elevation of the proposed extension would sit on a similar building line to both neighbouring properties, cumulatively, the overall depth and incongruous design of the proposed rear extension would appear bulky and overly dominant and would not be subordinate to the main dwelling. This extension would therefore fail to respect the chalet bungalow design of the original property.
6. Whilst the rear extension would not be visible within the street scene, it would be visible from the rear gardens of nearby residential properties. I also note the appellant's comments that the flat roof element of this rear extension would not be discernible from ground level. However, it would be likely to be visible from the rear gardens of neighbouring dwellings. The proposed rear extension would be overly prominent in the context of the host dwelling and adjacent properties. It would therefore harm the appearance and character of the existing bungalow and the surrounding area.
7. The appeal scheme also proposes to extend the front roof plane of the appeal property from a hipped to a gable roof, to include small dormer windows. Whilst this would significantly alter the appearance of the front elevation of the property, the design and scale would sit comfortably in the context of the existing dwelling. On my site visit, I noted that there is a mixture of property designs in the area, some of which are similar in appearance to this element of the appeal proposal. On this basis, the proposed extended front elevation would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the street scene. However, this would not outweigh the harm I have found in respect of the proposed rear extension.
8. Taking all of these matters into consideration, I conclude overall that the scheme would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area and would therefore be contrary to HLP1SP Policy BE1, Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of HLP2DMP and Paragraph 127 of the Framework.

Living Conditions

9. The side facing bedroom window at ground floor level of neighbouring property, No 16, is the only opening which serves that room. I acknowledge that, given the proximity of the window to the side elevation of the appellant's home, the bedroom is already enclosed by the appellant's property. However, given the overall scale, bulk and position of the appeal scheme, it would unacceptably further reduce the level of daylight to the side bedroom window. Also, it would appear overbearing and unacceptably harm the outlook of the neighbouring occupier. The proposal therefore fails to meet the requirements of Policy BE1 of HLP1SP and Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of HLP2DMP, which seek to safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Other Matters

10. I have considered an example of a residential extension within the area, 23 Keswick Gardens, which the appellant believes sets a precedent for the appeal site. Based on the information before me, it appears that whilst that scheme also includes a gable projection, the detailed design differs from the appeal proposal in other regards. For example, the gable projection does not include a crown flat roof area. In addition, it appears that consent for this extension was granted in 2011 and therefore predates the design requirements of the current development plan and the framework. Also, each proposal must be considered on its own merits. Therefore, in considering the appeal I attach limited weight to this matter.
11. I note that representations were made by local residents, raising additional concerns. However, given my findings on the main issues, it is not necessary to consider these matters in detail.

Conclusion

12. I conclude that the proposal as a whole would not accord with the development plan for the area. There are no identified material planning considerations which outweigh the conflict with the development plan and the framework. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR