



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2022

Decision by Alison Scott (BA Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3290030

21 Tiverton Road, Ruislip, HA4 0BW

- 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 & Mrs Quay against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon Council.
 - The application Ref 73915/APP/2021/3221, dated 23 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is 2 storey side extension involving the demolition of an existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - The character and appearance of the street scene; and
 - The living conditions of the adjacent occupants with regards to a sense of overbearing and enclosure and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is an end of terrace two-storey house situated in a short terrace row of houses. The character of the area is suburban residential. Tiverton Road is a planned road of houses of slight variation to their form although many share the same design characteristics.
4. The appeal property has changed the traditional hipped roof and replaced this with a gable end. The Council's policy does not support two-storey extensions to houses that have been altered in this manner. Although this may be set down in policy, that is not to say that the context of the circumstances of the site, and how it is experienced in its environment, are not part of the overall assessment.
5. Having said that, in this case, I can see that the design of the proposed roof is intended to recreate the original hipped roof. As a consequence of extending from a roof that has been altered into a gable end, it would create a roof format that appears disjointed and out of character with the main roof. This would be further emphasized by the proposed step in ridge height. From the

front and side elevation, this distinctive lack of integration would harm the character of the host dwelling.

6. There may be other hipped roof extensions visible within the local area. However, these cannot be compared to the situation before me. The addition of this style of roof attached the current roof would not respect the character of the dwelling. Irrespective of whether or not the local residents or other Council departments have raised no objections, it would appear as a visually intrusive feature that would harm the character and appearance of the terrace and the street scene.
7. To conclude on this main issue, given the design would not respect the characteristics of the dwelling or represent good design, I therefore find that the proposal would not meet the design expectations of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies 2012 and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies 2020.

Living conditions

8. The proposed two storey extension would extend close to the shared boundary with 19 Tiverton Road. This dwelling has an attached garage located between the side of the dwelling and the shared boundary with the appeal property. The dwelling has a small rear extension that extends over more than half the width of the original house with a reasonable gap to the shared boundary with the appeal property. The paved patio area extends the full width of the plot and is a moderately sized space. The outlook from rear of the dwelling and garden is open in character onto a generously sized garden space.
9. Even though a two-storey extension is proposed, and it would project close to the party boundary by in-filling most of the side gap, given the position of the existing garage of the adjacent neighbour, this provides a standoff to the main house. I appreciate the extension would project further along the party boundary than their rear garage wall, and would be seen from rear windows. However, this would be at a separation distance from these windows that would ensure the extension would not appear as excessive development thus compromising their outlook. The outlook from Number 19 would otherwise remain open in character. All things considered, the projection would not result in a sense of enclosure or feeling of overbearing development from rear habitable room windows. In addition, it would not harm the outlook from these windows.
10. It would be visible from the neighbour's patio area although this space is wide, and again provides an open outlook. The proposal would not lead to visual intrusion when seen from this space or the remainder of the external garden space.
11. Therefore, to conclude on this main issue, taking into account the circumstances of the relationship of the proposal with the neighbouring property, it would not lead to harm arising to the living conditions of neighbouring occupants at 19 Tiverton Road. It would thus meet the objectives of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies 2012 and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies 2020 in their combined aims to protect the living conditions of local occupants.

Balance and Conclusion

12. I have found that the proposal would lead to detrimental harm arising to the character and appearance of the street scene. It would however not result in an adverse impact upon the living conditions of the adjacent occupants. I appreciate the additional space it would provide to the appellants and the advantages of this and home working practices. In addition, it would remove a poor quality garage. However, all things considered, they would not outweigh the negative effects to the character and appearance of the street scene.
13. Therefore, in light of my assessment of the main issues, it would thus lead to conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR