



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 June 2023

**by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 06 July 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3318278**

**64 Hartland Drive, Ruislip, Hillingdon HA4 0TH**

- 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 Dr Senthuran Jeyapalan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref 40278/APP/2022/2898 dated 19 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 December 2022.
  - The development proposed is erection of a brick conservatory to rear and demolition of existing garage at rear of garden.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matters

2. The Council changed the description of development from that stated on the application form in the interests of clarity. I consider that the amended description accurately describes the appeal scheme and accordingly I have adopted the amended description in the heading above.

### Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on (i) the character and appearance of existing property and area in general; and (ii) the living conditions of occupiers of the adjoining properties.

### Reasons

#### *Character and Appearance*

4. The site is a mid-terraced property within a predominantly residential area, the property and others in the area have been extended and altered. The application site and the adjacent properties have similar single storey rear extensions.
5. Policy DMHD 1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon, Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) (the Local Plan: Part 2) outlines recommendations for the depth of rear extensions. The proposed development projecting from the existing extension would exceed the recommendations. Nonetheless, the depth of the proposed development would not be out of keeping with the area or the existing property.

6. Notwithstanding this the roof design of the proposed development joining the shallow mono pitch roof of the existing extension would appear contrived and would be an unsympathetic and incongruous addition to the existing property.
7. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the existing property and area in general. There is conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon's A Vision for 2026, Local Plan: Part 1, Strategic Policies (2012) (the Local Plan: Part 1) and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 the Local Plan: Part 2 which amongst other things seek to ensure developments are of high quality design which respect the design of the original property.

#### *Living Conditions*

8. The proposed development would project 3m beyond the existing rear extension. The existing single storey rear extension is similar in scale and design to those at No's 62 and 66. High boundary fencing surrounds the appeal plot limiting views to a degree into adjacent gardens.
9. No. 66 Hartland Drive has a conservatory projecting from the rear extension which is set off the shared boundary with the appeal site. The conservatory at No. 66 has clear glazing facing towards the appeal site. Notwithstanding this a condition could be imposed requiring the proposed development to provide obscure glazing along the side elevations to prevent overlooking.
10. Obscure glazing along the side elevations of the proposed development combined with the existing fencing would sufficiently mitigate any sense of being overlooked.
11. The scale and design of the proposed development would not be excessive and would not appear overbearing to the occupiers of neighbouring properties.
12. I find that the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining properties.
13. There is no conflict with Policy BE1 of the Local Plan: Part 1 and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Local Plan: Part 2 which amongst other things seek to protect the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties.

#### **Conclusion**

14. I have found that the proposed development would not harm to the living conditions of occupiers of adjoining properties, however this does not outweigh the harm I have identified in terms of the character and appearance of the existing property and area.
15. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

*C Pipe*

INSPECTOR