



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2023

by A Caines BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3312167

15 Myrtle Avenue, Ruislip, Hillingdon HA4 8SA

- 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 Harmanjit Gidda against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 77105/APP/2022/2498, dated 9 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 October 2022.
- The development proposed is demolition of garage and erection of single-storey side extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of garage and erection of single-storey side extension at 15 Myrtle Avenue, Ruislip, Hillingdon HA4 8SA in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 77105/APP/2022/2498, dated 9 August 2022, 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: AL(00)01 RevA; AL(00)02 RevA; AL(02)01 RevG; AL(02)02 RevE; AL(02)03 RevF.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the host building and street scene.

Reasons

3. Myrtle Avenue is an established residential street characterised by a mix of detached and semi-detached houses, including some bungalows. Many of these have been extended and altered. The differences in house types, size, appearance, and the gaps between properties, results in a varied street scene.
4. The appeal property is one half of a two-storey, semi-detached house and has a detached garage at the side. It is situated on a wider plot than most, such that there is a sense of space and separation to No 17 that is not commonly found elsewhere in the street. The other half of the semi-detached pair has an attached side garage.

5. There is no dispute that the side extension would exceed half the width of the original property. This is contrary to criteria C(i) of Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies 2020 (DMP). Nevertheless, it would be single storey in height with a low profile. It would not project beyond the front wall of the house and would retain a large gap of around 4.5 metres to the side boundary. When viewed in context with the whole of the semi-detached pair and the spacious garden setting, I am content that the extension would appear as a clearly subordinate and modest addition to the host building and would not be cramped in the plot. Furthermore, due to its modest size, matching materials, and the existing garage at No 13, any effect on the symmetry of the semi-detached pair would be minimal.
6. Consequently, despite the identified conflict with criteria C(i) of Policy DMHD 1, I find that the extension would not cause harm to the character or appearance of the host building and street scene. In these regards, there is compliance with other relevant requirements of Policy DMHD 1 where it seeks to ensure there is no adverse impact on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area; achieves a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings; is subordinate to the main dwelling; respects the design and materials of the original house; and retains adequate garden space. The proposal also complies with DMP Policy DMHB11, and Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (2012), in so far as they require new development, including extensions, to be well designed and to harmonise with the local context.

Conditions

7. The standard commencement and approved plans conditions are imposed for certainty. A condition requiring the external materials to match the existing building would ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR