
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 July 2018

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 July 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/18/3200323

13 Perry Close, Uxbridge, UB8 3HR

- 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 I Daly against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 11729/APP/2018/170, dated 13 January 2018, was refused by notice dated 9 March 2018.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part two-storey and part first-floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a part two-storey and part first-floor side extension at 13 Perry Close, Uxbridge, UB8 3HR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 11729/APP/2018/170, dated 13 January 2018, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan at scale 1:1250, Block Plan at scale 1:500, Drg No 01 Rev D and Drg No 02.
 - 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.

Procedural Matter

2. The appeal property was given a Certificate of Lawful Development in December 2017 (Ref 11729/APP/2017/3674) for works described as the conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer and conversion of roof from hip to gable end. These works are shown as existing on the application Drg No 02 but are annotated as being subject to construction as permitted development. I saw at the time of my visit that work to implement these changes appeared to have commenced and I have no reason

to believe that they would not be completed lawfully in accordance with the Certificate that has been given. Therefore, although I have considered the entirety of the works to the original dwelling that are shown on the proposed plans, I have concentrated upon the additional works that go beyond those that are being implemented as permitted development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions at 12 and 12a Perry Close, with particular regard to visual impact and daylight.

Reasons

4. No 13 is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located squarely at the southern end of a short residential cul-de-sac. No 12, one half of a semi-detached pair, is located to the west side and is orientated perpendicular to No 13, with its original outside flank wall approximately aligned with the front elevation to the appeal property. The outlook from the front of No 12 is over the front garden to No 13 and obliquely to one side over the public domain. No 12 has been extended to the side with 12a added as an independent, two-storey dwelling. This faces towards the side elevation of No 13.
5. The appeal property has an existing garage attached to its side elevation. This extends up to the side, west boundary of the appeal site and is approximately 9m from the face of No 12a according to measurements provided by the Council. The proposal would add a two-storey side addition for the full depth of the house by building at first floor over the garage and behind it at two-storey height, but recessed 1m from the front and side elevations of the garage.
6. The outlook from No 12 would be largely unaffected by the proposal. The windows do not directly face the flank wall of the existing garage and although the bulk of the appeal property would be projected towards No 12, it would be seen appropriately domestic in scale and appearance, and only at an angle, with sight across the frontage of No 13 and over Perry Close unaffected.
7. The outlook from the front of No 12a is already constrained, to a degree, by the nature of the layout that was accepted when planning permission was granted for its construction. Nevertheless, there is a reasonable amount of space around this dwelling. I am not persuaded that the extension of No 13 towards 12a would have any significant impact upon daylight penetrating the space between the buildings or the living spaces within this adjoining property, particularly also considering the path of the sun and the direct sunlight that would be available to the front of No 12a during the middle part of the day.
8. Visually, the two-storey scale of No 13 would appear closer. However, it would merely be reflective of the existing flank elevation of the appeal property and would again be domestic in scale and appearance. Given the prevailing arrangement for 12a, I am satisfied that the proposal would not impose itself to any significant further degree that would alter the outlook or be visually intrusive.
9. Overall, for the reasons given, I find that the proposal would not be harmful to the living conditions at Nos 12 or 12a Perry Close. There would therefore be no conflict Policies BE19, BE20 or BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two -

Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) or the guidance within the *Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions* insofar as they all seek to ensure that new development complements the character and appearance of the area and does not harm the amenities of existing houses.

Conditions

10. A condition specifying the relevant drawings is necessary as this provides certainty. To safeguard the character and appearance of the area a condition is necessary to require the external materials proposed for the extension to match the existing building.

Conclusion

11. Accordingly, and in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR