

APPEAL STATEMENT

PART TWO STOREY SIDE AND PART FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION

13 PERRY CLOSE, HILLINGDON - Planning Reference 11729/APP/2018/170



1 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1.1. The application site is located at the end of Perry Close, Hillingdon and comprises a semi-detached ground and first storey house with three bedrooms on original first floor, an original projecting single storey garage (with shallow sloping corrugated roof). The site also has a Certificate of Lawful Development for a hip to gable loft conversion.

1.2. Perry Close is characterised by a mix of residential properties that are predominately semi-detached Houses and detached bungalows. Most of the buildings have been extended in varying forms including loft conversions, first floor and two storey side extensions, rear extensions and single storey side extensions. Some of the properties are purpose built flats and No 12 has been extended by two storeys to the side and approved (under appeal) for use as a two flats

1.3. Roof form in the area is mixed with hipped roofs predominating

1.4. The existing three bedroomed property has a small conservatory to the rear. The front garden has been fully laid to hardstanding.

1.5. The application property is adjacent to Nos 12 and 12a (an extended and converted half of a pair of semis – which is detached from the appeal site and appears to be currently used as 5 No dwellings) and No 14 which has been made into a gable ended property following conversion of the roof space and forms the other half of the semi to the appeal site. The detached bungalow at the rear of the appeal site at No 30 Goulds Green is used as a car sales facility.

1.6. The application site lies within the 'Developed Area' as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

2 The Proposal

2.1. This application comprises a household application for the erection of a first floor side extension above the existing garage and a two storey element to the rear of the garage. The proposal sets in the first floor by 1.1m from the existing flank wall of the retained ground floor garage wall and by 1m from the principle front elevation above the retained garages front elevation. The extension will provide an additional bedroom on the first floor and incorporate alterations to the existing bathroom.

2.2. The application proposes a gable ended roof to match the proposed gable designed with the Hip to Gable designed in the Certificate of Lawful Development Loft Conversion. The new ridge is proposed to be set down by 300mm

2.3. This application was made following refusal of a similar scheme as a free resubmission. The previous scheme proposed an alternative roof form (details attached).

3 Policy Context

3.1. The Development Plan comprises the Mayor of London's Plan for London, the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (Strategic Policies) and Part 2 (Saved UDP Policies).

3.2. In addition to the Development Plan the Council has adopted supplementary planning guidance in the form of the Council's Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement), which is also referred to as the HDAS.

3.3. For obvious reasons no conflict is identified with the policies of the London Plan.

3.4. Reason for refusal 1

"The proposed extensions, by virtue of its size, scale, bulk and proximity, would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupier at 12 and 12A Perry Close by reason of overdominance, overshadowing, visual intrusion, loss of light and loss of outlook. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies

(November 2012) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions."

The singular reason for refusal cites 3No Policies and the HDAS for Residential Extensions

Policy BE19 - THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY WILL SEEK TO ENSURE THAT NEW DEVELOPMENT WITHIN RESIDENTIAL AREAS COMPLEMENTS OR IMPROVES THE AMENITY AND CHARACTER OF THE AREA.

The Planning Officers report confirms that the Planners are happy with the design of the proposed extension so we are not sure why this policy has been put on the refusal notice.

Policy BE20 - BUILDINGS SHOULD BE LAID OUT SO THAT ADEQUATE DAYLIGHT AND SUNLIGHT CAN PENETRATE INTO AND BETWEEN THEM AND THE AMENITIES OF EXISTING HOUSES ARE SAFEGUARDED

The Planning Officers report confirms that the proposal causes no loss of light, outlook or privacy to No14, however it is stated that the *"Whilst it is acknowledged that the windows in the front elevation of numbers 12 and 12A already look at the flank wall of the garage of the application property, the significant increase in bulk to the side of the property resulting from the two storey extension would result in an unacceptable loss of outlook to the occupants of these properties"*. The outlook of the properties at 12 and 12a is as stated already facing the flank wall of the garage and the first floor of the existing house. The proposed extension on moves the first floor element closer by 2.475m and improves the appearance of the corrugated asbestos roof with a tiled sloping roof around the front and flank elevations at the transition between ground and first floor levels. It should also be highlighted that the majority of the building at 12/12a that faces the flank wall of No 13 was a two-storey extension.

There is also an extension built to the first floor of No4 Perry Close, another corner plot, which was built facing the flats at 3c and 3d, this scheme was approved in 20th April 2012 and the front elevation of flats 3c and 3d are now set approximately 7.5m from the flank of No 4

We are convinced that the improved visual outlook provided by the proposal would enhance the outlook for No12/12a and also believe that the proposal is no worse than the allowed scheme at No4

Policy BE21 - PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NOT BE GRANTED FOR NEW BUILDINGS OR EXTENSIONS WHICH BY REASON OF THEIR SITING, BULK AND PROXIMITY, WOULD RESULT IN A SIGNIFICANT LOSS OF RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

We are not sure why it is considered that the proposal results in a SIGNIFICANT loss of residential amenity, let alone any loss at all. It has been acknowledged that the scheme complies with the guidance set out in the HDAS for Residential Extensions (which covers the siting and bulk elements of the policy) but the Planner has failed to be specific about how the proximity of the proposal might cause a reduction residential amenity.

4 Conclusions

4.1. The Inspector is respectfully invited to allow this appeal, it is believed that the proposal complies with all of the policies and guidance provided and that there is local precedent for the extension design and setting.