



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 September 2020 by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3252850

127 Beverley Road, Ruislip HA4 9AP

- 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 Mrs Natalie Fahey against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 48927/APP/2020/282, dated 28 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 March 2020.
- The development proposed is a two storey/ground floor side & rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part two storey part single storey side/rear extension at 127 Beverley Road, Ruislip HA4 9AP in accordance with the terms of application Ref 48927/APP/2020/282, dated 28 January 2020 and subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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 dated 03/10/2019; proposed plans & block plan 2074.2 Rev B; existing plans 2074.1 Rev A.
 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.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary matters

3. I have used the description of the development from the Council's decision notice in my formal decision as opposed to that stated on the application form as I consider this to be more precise.
4. The Council's planning officer report indicates that the proposal does not meet all the detailed criteria for extensions to dwellings set out in Policy DMHD 1 of the Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies (LP Part 2), particularly in relation to the width of the first-floor element and the height of the single storey element. Nevertheless, this does not form part of the Council's reason for refusal, which relates to the overall scale of the proposal

and its proximity to the side boundary. I shall consider the appeal proposal on the basis of the reason for refusal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site relates to an end of terrace, two-storey dwelling located on a corner plot, within a residential area. The appeal dwelling is set back from the road and set in from the northern side boundary. Neighbouring properties located on corner plots are generally sited closer than the appeal dwelling to their side boundary.
7. The ground floor of the side/rear extension would be flush with the main elevation and would fully wrap around the side and rear elevations of the host dwelling. The northern side fence is at an angle with the house, thus whilst the extension would have a constant sideways projection, the gap between the ground floor extension and the boundary would decrease considerably towards the rear. The first-floor of the side/rear extension would be well set back from the main elevation and set in from both sides.
8. Whilst the ground floor of the extension would significantly reduce the gap between the dwelling and the northern boundary fence, the first-floor would be sufficiently set in from the boundary, set back from the main elevation, and set down from the main ridge as to ensure that the proposal does not appear as a cramped addition. Notwithstanding the prominent position of the dwelling within the street scene, given the siting and scale of the extension, the proposal would not result in an overdevelopment of the site.
9. Given that the appeal property has a larger gap to the side than the neighbouring properties opposite the road, the extension would be well incorporated without affecting the openness of the street scene to a detrimental degree. Moreover, given the size and scale of extensions elsewhere in the vicinity of the site, including on the opposite side of the road, the proposal would not appear unduly dominant in the street scene.
10. Accordingly, I conclude that the appeal development would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, the development would not conflict with the aims of Policy BE1 of the Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies, and Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the LP Part 2, which collectively require, amongst other things, that developments have no adverse impact on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area.

Conditions and Recommendation

11. In the interests of proper planning and to provide certainty I have recommended the standard time limit condition and have specified the approved plans. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, a condition that specifies that matching materials are used in the development is necessary. These conditions have also been suggested by the Council in the event that the appeal was allowed.

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

Andreea Spataru

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR