



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 April 2025 by E Nutman

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3358175

106 Torrington Road, Ruislip HA4 0AU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Anil Parmar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref is 28633/APP/2024/2601.
- The development proposed is described as 'Rear garden annexe to provide extra garden and pantry storage and entertainment space'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site is located in a residential area mainly characterised by two-storey dwellings set back from front boundaries with similarly proportioned rear gardens. 106 Torrington Road is a two storey, end terrace dwelling. Its rear garden contains two small wooden sheds which are located close to the rear boundary. The site is bordered to one side by the neighbouring property at 108 Torrington Road and to the other by a driveway which provides access to the rear of properties along Torrington Road and Tiverton Road. Many properties along Torrington Road, Tiverton Road and the wider locality have outbuildings to the end of their rear gardens.
5. The evidence before me indicates that the internal floor space of the outbuilding would be 48sq m. The supporting text to Policy DMHD 2 Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies (January 2020) (LPP2) indicates that outbuildings should be no greater than 30 square metres. While I accept that this figure is a general guide, when combined with its height, substantial pitched roof

and lean-to canopy, the outbuilding would not appear proportionate to the host dwelling. Even accounting for the use of high quality materials, this would not be sufficient to assimilate the outbuilding's substantial bulk and mass which would have undue dominance within the rear garden environment. Due to its height significantly above boundary fencing and walls, and even accounting for vegetation in gardens, the proposal would be unduly prominent when experienced from the nearest neighbouring windows and gardens.

6. From visiting the site, I acknowledge that large outbuildings are a common feature in the area. These range in terms of form and materials and many also extend the full width of the plots they sit within. However, the outbuildings are more often low in height with shallow pitched or flat roofs, particularly in the more immediate surroundings of the appeal site. This means that they generally have a discreet presence within their respective plots and when experienced from neighbouring properties. Therefore, they are not comparable to the more dominant form of the appeal proposal.
7. I have no reason to doubt that the outbuilding would not be used for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the host dwelling. Indeed, the Council's officer report confirms that the proposed use did not form part of its reason for refusal and a condition could ensure that the outbuilding would not be segregated or used as independent living accommodation. Even so, this does not overcome my concerns in respect of the harm that would result to the character and appearance of the area as a result of the scale of the proposal.
8. In conclusion, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHB 2, DMHB 11 and DMHD 12 of the LPP2 which seek high quality design and require that development is well integrated with the surrounding area, harmonises with the local context including in terms of the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures and that outbuildings are proportionate to the dwelling house.
9. The Council's decision also refers to Policy DMHD 1 of the LLP2. I have not identified conflict with this policy as it primarily relates to extensions to dwellings and outbuildings are specifically addressed under Policy DMHD 2 of the same development plan document. In any case, this does not diminish the conflict with the identified policies in my conclusion.

Other Matters

10. The Council did not identify any potential harm in respect of neighbouring living conditions. From my own observations, given the position of the outbuilding away from the habitable windows and the more immediate garden areas next to the rear elevations of neighbouring dwellings, I am also satisfied that neighbouring living conditions would not be harmed.
11. The appellant contends that the proposal would make optimal use of land and that the fabric of the building would minimise energy demand. However, these are not factors which justify the harm I have identified under the main issue.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Nutman

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR