
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 August 2016

by Debbie Moore BSc (HONS) MCD MRTPI PGDip

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

Decision date: 10 August 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3150771

52 Harlyn Drive, Eastcote, Hillingdon HA5 2DA.

- 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 S Tokikar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 13868/APP/2016/978, dated 7 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as "part two storey, part single storey rear extension, single storey side extension, installation of 2 x side dormers to create additional habitable space at first floor level and conversion of garage to habitable use involving alterations to front and demolition of existing rear and side elements".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part two storey, part single storey rear extension, single storey side extension, installation of 2 x side dormers to create additional habitable space at first floor level and conversion of garage to habitable use involving alterations to front and demolition of existing rear and side elements at 52 Harlyn Drive, Eastcote, Hillingdon HA5 2DA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 13868/APP/2016/978, dated 7 March 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Existing and Proposed Plans and Elevations, Drawing No STO.PA.2016.A101, Rev P01, dated 03.03.2016.
 - 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 is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached 'chalet' style house located within a residential area characterised by houses of a similar architectural style. The
-

house has an existing single story extension and a rear conservatory that would be replaced by the proposed development. There is also an existing first floor side extension on one side of the roofslope.

4. The first floor side extensions would extend for virtually the full length of the original house and would alter the original roof profile. However, there are numerous examples of similar extensions in the vicinity and large first floor side extensions now form part of the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, the development would integrate with the street scene and the extended house would not stand out as being of an uncharacteristic design.
5. The two storey rear extension would be screened in views from the road and, as there is no development adjoining the appeal property at the rear, the only views would be from the rear gardens of neighbouring properties. The neighbouring houses also have two storey rear extensions. Consequently, the proposed extension would not appear intrusive when considered in this context and the street scene would be unaffected.
6. The Council agrees that the development would not have an adverse effect on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers.
7. I conclude that the development would not have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. It would comply with Policy BE1 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies (2012) which seeks, amongst other things, to achieve a high quality of design. It would also comply with saved Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Local Plan Part 2 which require development to harmonise with the street scene and design of the original building and complement or improve the amenity and character of the area.
8. Although the first floor side extensions would be prominent when viewed from the road, the development would reflect the design of several other extensions to properties in the immediate vicinity. Consequently, the development would meet the aims of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document on Residential Extensions¹ which seeks to protect the appearance of the original house and the character of the local area.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition to ensure matching materials to secure good design.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed.

Debbie Moore

Inspector

¹ Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) – Residential Extensions (adopted December 2008)