
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2022

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3294226

14 Bridle Road, Pinner, Eastcote HA5 2SJ

- 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 and Mrs Thakrar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 6860/APP/2021/3713, dated 2 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is double storey rear extension, first floor side extension and garage conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for double storey rear extension, first floor side extension and garage conversion at 14 Bridle Road, Pinner, Eastcote HA5 2SJ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 6860/APP/2021/3713, dated 2 October 2021, 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: 1020; 1050; 1051; 1250.
 - 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, except where otherwise indicated on drawing No 1250.

Procedural Matters

2. During the Council's determination of the appeal planning application, the Council refused to accept an amended plan [Drawing 1050 Rev A] on the basis that it brought the development closer to a neighbouring property and would have required re-consultation. To avoid prejudice to any party I have considered the appeal on the same basis using the plans originally submitted, as reflected in Condition 2 above.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effects of the development on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area;
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of 16 Bridle Road, with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Bridle Road is characterised by two-storey detached and semi-detached houses, which are set back from the road on relatively long plots in an established suburban setting. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling flanked by similar properties on both sides (Nos 12 and 16).
5. Policy DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) (the DMP) requires that, among other things, two-storey side extensions should be set in a minimum of 1 metre from the side boundary to maintain adequate visual separation between houses.
6. In this case, the separation to the side boundary with No 16 would be approximately 0.7 metres. Nonetheless, that is already the situation with the existing garage which will be used as the basis for the proposed side extension. Although the proposed side extension would fill more of the space at first floor level, it would be set well back from the front elevation with a corresponding lower ridge line. This would achieve an appropriate degree of subservience to the host building and ensure that the side extension is not prominent when viewed from the street. In addition, as a clear separation would still be maintained to No 16 the extension would not appear cramped. Furthermore, I did not identify any strong rhythm to the spacing between properties in this part of Bridle Road. Thus, despite some minor conflict with the requirements of DMP Policy DMHD1 in terms of the distance to the side boundary, I am satisfied that the gap to No 16 would not be harmfully eroded and that the established character of the street scene would be maintained.
7. The majority of the massing would be located to the rear with both two-storey and single-storey elements across the full width of the rear elevation. However, Policy DMHD1 only prohibits full-width rear extensions to listed buildings and in conservation areas, neither of which apply in this case. There would be some conflict with the requirements of Policy DMHD1 as the depth of the single-storey element, when combined with the two-storey element, would exceed 4 metres. Even so, at 5 metres total projection, the depth of the rear extensions would still be limited in the overall context of the size of the rear garden and would not harm the spacious verdant character to the rear. While some concern is expressed over the use of a crown roof, this would not be a large feature, nor would it be prominent from the public realm. In any event, crown roofs are not an uncharacteristic feature of the area. In this context and given the limited private vantage points from which it would be seen, the development would not be overly dominant in relation to the host dwelling, or out of keeping with the local development pattern and character of the area.
8. I therefore conclude that the development would not unacceptably harm the character or appearance of the host property and surrounding area. Thus, despite conflict with some of the detailed criteria of DMP Policy DMHD1 as stated, the proposal complies with the overarching design aims of this Policy, which among other things, require that alterations and extensions respect the design of the original house and ensure there is no adverse cumulative impact on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area. The proposal also complies with DMP Policy DMHB11, and Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (2012) (the SP) in so far as

they require new development, including extensions, to be well designed and to harmonise with the local context.

Living conditions of neighbours

9. The Council's concern in this regard relates only to No 16, which is also a two-storey detached property with a long rear garden. It has a two-storey bay at the rear, near to the boundary fence with the appeal property. The windows of the bay have a south east aspect enjoying good levels of sunlight and outlook.
10. The Council contends that the development would breach a 45 degree line of sight from No 16's bay window. However, I note that the '45 degree 'line of sight test' set out in Policy DMHD1 only applies to two-storey extensions. In this case, it is only the ground floor element which would marginally breach a 45 degree line taken from the centre of No 16's bay window, so I find no conflict with Policy DMHD1 in that regard. With a projection of just 3 metres, and having regard to the separation distance off the boundary, the first floor element would not be an overbearing feature in the outlook from No 16.
11. Whilst the depth of the single-storey element would exceed the requirements of DMP Policy DMHD1 by 1 metre, its distance from the boundary, coupled with its modest height, roof design, and the intervening boundary treatment, would ensure that this element would not appear overbearing, or cause any harmful overshadowing of No 16's bay window and garden. Moreover, No 16 benefits from a long rear outlook which would not change.
12. I therefore conclude that the development would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 16, with particular regard to outlook and light. Thus, despite conflict with some of the detailed criteria of DMP Policy DMHD1 as stated, the proposal complies with its overarching amenity requirements to ensure a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved and that there is no unacceptable loss of outlook.

Conditions

13. As suggested in the Council's appeal questionnaire, the standard commencement and approved plans conditions are imposed for certainty. A condition requiring the external materials to match the existing building would ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development; however, a minor alteration to the wording of the condition is required to reflect the use of render on some parts of the extensions.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR