



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2023

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3321181

40A Flamborough Road, Ruislip, Hillingdon HA4 0DJ

- 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 Terence Manuel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 58975/APP/2023/392, dated 10 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 4 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is a ground floor single storey rear extension, with internal alterations and roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a ground floor single storey rear extension, with internal alterations and roof lights at 40A Flamborough Road, Ruislip, Hillingdon HA4 0DJ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 58975/APP/2023/392, dated 10 February 2023, 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: 01, 02, 03, 04, 06, 07 and 08.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - whether the occupants of the host property would experience appropriate living conditions having regard to the availability of outdoor amenity space.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The host property sits at the end of a terrace, and is prominently located at the junction of Flamborough Road and Sidmouth Drive. Whilst relatively modern, its siting, form, design, and pebble-dashed finish reflect the characteristics of the older properties which prevail in the area. That said, it projects slightly further to the rear at two storeys high compared to most of the other properties in this row.

4. The proposed extension would have a limited depth, and a modest single storey height with a shallow pitched roof, such that it would appear clearly subordinate to the host. Only the uppermost part of it would be visible in the streetscene above the boundary fence. It would also be finished with matching pebbledash and red/brown tiles, which would help to integrate it with the host and with its surroundings.
5. A significant gap would be retained between the rear face of the proposed extension and the large outbuilding at the end of the host's rear garden, which is itself only just visible from the highway above the fence. Consequently, the scheme would not appear cramped on the plot. Finally, I also observed that some nearby properties on corner plots have single storey rear projections, including opposite this site at 47 Flamborough Road, and at 12 Sidmouth Drive.
6. For these reasons, the scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It would not therefore conflict with Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two: Development Management Policies (2020) ('HLPP2') which, amongst other things, requires development to be designed to the highest standards, and to harmonise with its context, taking account of matters such as scale, mass, bulk and plot coverage.
7. Neither would it conflict with HLPP2 Policy DMHD 1's broad requirement for extensions to appear subordinate to the main dwelling, and to avoid an adverse impact on the character, appearance and quality of the street and the area, having regard to cumulative impacts.

Living conditions

8. Part A vi) of HLPP2 Policy DMHD 1 states that extensions should ensure that adequate garden space is retained, but it does not provide any quantitative or qualitative measures.
9. According to the Council's calculations, the scheme would leave approximately 45sqm of amenity space for the occupiers. That space would be relatively private and, with its south-easterly aspect, would benefit from good natural light. It would therefore provide the occupants with appropriate space to sit outside and relax, play, or to perform typical outdoor domestic tasks such as hanging laundry. The scheme would thus provide suitable living conditions for the occupiers, and it would not conflict with HLPP2 Policy DMHD 1.

Conditions and Conclusion

10. Turning to the matter of conditions, I have imposed the standard time limit for commencement and, in the interests of certainty, a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Finally, in the interests of good design, a matching materials condition is necessary.
11. Summing up, the scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the area, and it would provide the occupants with appropriate living conditions. Consequently, having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR