
Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 30 September 2021

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3281742

112 Coleridge Drive, Eastcote, Ruislip HA4 8GW

- 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 Renay Purmasir against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 76356/APP/2021/1517, dated 14 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey rear extension and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have not been provided with a copy of the Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions (SPD) referred to by the Council and the appellant. However, the relevant standards in particular in respect of the depth of proposed extensions and private outdoor amenity space, are also referred to in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies and were referred to by the Council in determining the application and specifically referred to in the Decision Notice.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - i. the living conditions of the occupiers of the appeal property with regards outside space
 - ii. the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property 110 Coleridge Drive, with particular regards to outlook and light.

Reasons

Living Conditions – occupiers of appeal property

4. Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 18 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (the DM), amongst other matters, seek to incorporate principles of good design and protect the living conditions of the

occupiers of new development and their neighbours, including reference to defined standards.

5. Specifically, DMHB 18 refers to Table 5.3 which details a requirement for 100sqm of "private outdoor amenity space" for a 4-bedroom property. The Council details that as a result of the appeal scheme the existing 48.sqm of private amenity space would be reduced to 33.5sqm. These figures are not disputed by the appellant, but reference is made to the effect that the appeal dwellings does not currently meet the standard set out in DMHB 18.
6. Regardless of the outdoor space standards that existed at the time the appeal property was granted planning permission, the appeal scheme would substantially reduce the existing private outdoor space at the appeal dwelling. The residual amount would be a little over one third of what the Development Plan states is currently required for a property such as the appeal property.
7. While the appellant asserts that a good standard of outdoor amenity space would remain, no substantive evidence has been provided to support his assertion. I saw at the site visit that the existing garden is a small and enclosed space and as a result of the appeal scheme would be substantially reduced.
8. For the reasons detailed above I find that the appeal scheme would fail to provide adequate living conditions of the occupiers of the appeal property with regards outside space contrary to Policy DMHB 18, DMHB 11 and DMHB 1 of the DM.

Living Conditions – occupiers of 110 Coleridge Drive

9. The submitted plans show that the proposed single storey rear extension would project some 3m from the rear elevation of the appeal property and would be the full width of the rear elevation.
10. Policy DMHD 1 of the DM refers to alterations and extensions and specifically B) i) that rear extensions should not exceed 3.3 metres. Therefore, the appeal scheme is in accordance with that specific part of Policy DMHD 1.
11. While I have not been provided with a plan showing a 45-degree line from the closest windows of no.110, I saw at the site visit that a garage separates the appeal site from the main dwelling of no.110 and as such a good degree of separation would exist.
12. Furthermore, while the rear elevations of the appeal property and no.110 are approximately level, I saw at the site visit that a small single storey extension has been constructed at no.110.
13. For the reasons detailed above I find that the appeal scheme would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property 110 Coleridge Drive, with particular regards to outlook and light. As such, with regards this main issue, the appeal scheme is not contrary to Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the DM.

Conclusion

14. While I have not found harm with regards the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property, I have found harm regarding the living conditions of the occupiers of the appeal property.
15. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mr M Brooker

INSPECTOR

