



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 9 November 2020

by A Parkin BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 November 2020

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3257718
66 Whiteheath Avenue, Ruislip HA4 7PW**

- 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 Satpal Sagoo against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 31410/APP/2020/1403, dated 2 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 July 2020.
- The development proposed is a single storey side extension and a single storey rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension and a single storey rear extension at 66 Whiteheath Avenue, Ruislip HA4 7PW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 31410/APP/2020/1403, dated 2 May 2020, 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: 66WHITEHEATH/PL/ 20 P1; 24 P4; 25 P4; and 26 P4.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external walls of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is in a residential area characterised by traditional, 2-storey, semi-detached dwellings with front and rear gardens, many of which have been extended. The streets are broad, with grass verges and footpaths on both sides of the carriageway, with some of the verges containing semi-mature trees.
4. The appeal concerns a traditional 2-storey detached dwelling, which occupies a corner plot at the junction of Whiteheath Avenue and Ravenscourt Close. Its

front garden is bounded by a low brick wall with separate vehicular and pedestrian accesses and contains some mature shrubs and a tree.

5. A similarly designed and positioned detached dwelling, 68 Whiteheath Avenue, is located on the opposite side of Ravenscourt Close to the appeal dwelling, although its corner plot is narrower and the dwelling has a substantial single-storey gable extension to the rear. Nos 68 and 66 both have substantial timber fences along their side and rear boundaries with Ravenscourt Close.
6. The proposed development would entail the erection of two contemporary, single-storey, flat roofed extensions, one to the side of the appeal dwelling near to Ravenscourt Close and one to the rear, near the boundary with 64 Whiteheath Avenue.
7. No 64 and its joined neighbour No 62 both have single-storey, flat-roofed rear extensions, although due to their positions relative to the appeal building, these extend only a short distance beyond the main rear elevation of No 66. The proposed rear extension would maintain a similar separation distance to the boundary with No 64 as the existing dwelling, sufficient to walk along, and its design, size, massing and position would not be out of keeping with the area.
8. The proposed side extension would be located towards the rear of the dwelling, set back from the principal front elevation and a short distance from the boundary with Ravenscourt Close. The somewhat flared shape of the corner plot means that the space between the proposed side extension and the boundary would increase towards the rear.
9. The substantial timber fence by Ravenscourt Close, together with the brick wall and mature planting separating the front and rear gardens, already have some impact on openness here. The proposed side extension would further impinge on the space to the side of the dwelling somewhat. However, its flat-roofed design and single-storey height, together with its position away from the boundary with Ravenscourt Close, would limit this impact and would not significantly affect the spacious character of the area.
10. The scale, massing and positions of the proposed extensions would be subordinate to the host dwelling. The contemporary design of the proposed extensions are not unsympathetic to the host building, or to the character of the wider area, where many contemporary extensions are to be found. Furthermore, a more traditionally designed extension, such as with a pitched roof, would have had a greater impact on the openness to the side of the dwelling than the appeal proposal does.
11. Ravenscourt Close is a short cul-de-sac containing semi-detached dwellings positioned around a circular landscape feature; it does not have a strong building line relative to Nos 66 or 68. Whilst the proposed side extension would be positioned forward of that line on the northeastern side of the road, its scale, massing and position means it would not detract from the building line on Ravenscourt Close. Furthermore, the whole of No 68 is positioned forward of the corresponding building line on the southwestern side.
12. For these reasons the proposed development would not detract from the character and appearance of the area. It would, therefore, accord with Policy BE1 (Built Environment) of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies

November 2012 and with Policies DMHB11 (Design of New Development) and DMHD1 (Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings) of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies January 2020 (HLP2DMP).

13. Policy DMHB12 (Streets and Public Realm) of the HLP2DMP is not relevant to the appeal development.

Other Matters

14. The occupier of No 64 raised concerns regarding the impact of the proposed development on natural light at their property. The size, massing and position of the proposed rear extension mean it would not significantly affect the next door property, in terms of natural light or overshadowing.

Conditions and Conclusion

15. The Council has suggested a number of conditions to be attached to any grant of planning permission were the appeal to be allowed, which I have considered in light of Government guidance.
16. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition specifying the approved drawings would be necessary for reasons of certainty and to protect the character and appearance of the area.
17. A condition requiring the materials to be used in the construction of the external walls of the appeal development to match those used in the existing building would also be necessary, to protect the character and appearance of the area.
18. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Parkin

INSPECTOR