

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 December 2015

by David Murray BA (Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 04 January 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/15/3133176

27 Stafford Road, Ruislip, Middlesex, London, HA4 6PB.

- 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 Mrs J Edwards against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref. 70886/APP/2015/1756, dated 12 May 2015, was refused by notice [undated].
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side and part two storey rear extension, part single storey rear extension, involving demolition of existing conservatory and garden store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two storey side and part two storey rear extension, part single storey rear extension involving demolition of existing conservatory and garden store, at 27 Stafford Road, Ruislip, Middlesex, London, HA4 6PB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 70886/APP/2015/1756, dated 12 May 2015, and the plans submitted with it, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan – ARCH 111.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

Background

3. The appeal site contains a two storey end-of-terrace house situated in a residential area of similar properties. The site also lies adjacent to a gated access to other land to the rear and this space has open land to the side with trees and shrubs along the boundary with the appeal site. It is proposed to build a two extension to the side and rear of the house and with a part single storey extension to the rear adjoining the party wall with the neighbouring property.

Effect on character and appearance

4. The Council advise that the extensions proposed meet the local requirements of the Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Extensions – Hillingdon Design and Access Statement (2008) in terms of overall form and design, other than in respect of the set back from the side boundary of the site. The guidance recommends a setback of at least one metre from a side boundary whereas the proposal would be 0.2m from the boundary, although the guidance recognises that the 1m set back may be relaxed where the extension would abut a road or an open area.
5. In this case, the site lies adjacent to an open area with trees and shrubs along the boundary. The appellant says that the Cooper Beech, Ash and shrubs will need pruning but otherwise considers that the siting of the new work will not prejudice the trees being retained. The Council is concerned about the future of the trees but from my observations at my site visit, I do not share the Council's concerns, and I am satisfied that there is sufficient space for this vegetation not to be materially harmed by the side extension. I am also satisfied that the side extension would not erode the character of spaciousness formed by the gap between the appeal site with No. 29 - the opposite property along Stafford Road. Although the proposed side extension would result in a relatively large mass of side elevation, it is likely that much of this impact would be screened by the vegetation. Even if this screening on other land does not remain for whatever reason, I do not consider that the side elevation as extended would be significantly out of character with the general form of many other local properties, many of which appear to have been extended.
6. It also appears to me that the width of the extension would not materially increase the overall length of the terrace and dominate its character as the Council suggest. Although the extension would not be set back from the existing frontage, I find that the overall bulk and form the terrace would not be harmed by the proposal.
7. Overall, I am satisfied that the proposed additions would maintain the character and appearance of the host property and the terrace and would harmonise with its setting in the local street scene and complement the character of the area. As such, I find that the proposal generally complies with the relevant parts of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan – Part One – Strategic Policies, and the requirements of Policies CE13, CE15 and CE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan – Part Two Saved UDP Policies.
8. The Council recommend the standard conditions in respect of the timing of the development; matching materials; and accord with the approved plans. I agree that these conditions are reasonable and necessary in the interests of the appearance of the area and for clarity, and I will impose them.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Murray

INSPECTOR