



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2016

by Peter D. Biggers BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 03 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3156824
24 West Common Road, Uxbridge UB8 1NZ

- 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 Carl Sinclair against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon Council.
 - The application Ref 23488/APP/2016/1103 dated 4 April 2016 was refused by notice dated 13 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey side /rear extension and front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the erection of side and rear extension.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the alterations to form a front porch. Planning permission is granted for the front porch at 24 West Common Road, Uxbridge UB8 1NZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23488/APP/2016/1103, dated 4 April 2016 and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with those parts of the following approved plans related to the front porch: 15/0022/02; 15/0022/04; 15/0022/05; 15/0022/06.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the front porch hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area and particularly the North Uxbridge Area of Special Local Character.

Reasons

4. West Common Road, where the appeal site is located, is an attractive tree lined residential road fronting onto Uxbridge Common. A line of detached two storey houses in brick, render and tile line the west side of the road facing east over the common. No 24 is located on a corner plot on the junction of Norfolk Road and West Common Road and is built to the same design as No 25 on the south side of the junction. The south facing gable elevation of No 24 establishes the front building line for the houses on the north side of Norfolk Road. West Common Road
-

is part of the North Uxbridge Area of Special Local Character (ASLC) designated through the *Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan* (HUDP) to safeguard the area's open, spacious character of larger dwellings in generous plots.

5. The proposed 'wrap around', flat roof extension to No 24, in extending out from the side of the house to around one metre from the plot boundary, would project forward of the building line in Norfolk Road. I acknowledge that at present there is a close boarded fence and climbing plants on the Norfolk Road boundary which would partly screen the extension from the south. However from the west on Norfolk Road looking back to No 24 the extension would reduce the openness of the junction between Nos 24 and 25 and intrude in the view through to Uxbridge Common.
6. It has been put to me that the design of the extension would be modest in scale with the flat roof intended to reduce the height and mass to ensure it would be subordinate to the existing dwelling. Whilst I acknowledge that in terms of scale the extension would be subordinate, its positioning is such that it would necessitate the removal of part of the existing planting to the side of the property in particular the hedge which divides the front and rear gardens. With this planting removed the flat roof extension would be visible from the West Common Road frontage and the junction of Norfolk Road. Flat roofs at least on road frontages are uncharacteristic of the area and the extension would look out of keeping with the design of the property and the street scene and would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the ASLC. Although the appellant proposes landscaping this would be unlikely to satisfactorily mitigate the visual impact of the extension.
7. I have been referred to a permitted 2 storey side extension at No 8 North Common Road which the appellant considers is much more intrusive than the extension proposed at the appeal site. I have considered this case but the house is set much further back in its plot than is the case with No 24. The extension would replace a large outbuilding to the side of the property and would not raise the same issues regarding building lines. I am not satisfied that it is sufficiently similar to the appeal case to carry any weight and accordingly I have considered the appeal case on its own merits.
8. The *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework), policy BE1 of the *Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 Strategic Policies* (HLP) and saved policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the HUDP seek to promote quality in design and promote development that complements and improves the character of the area. The Framework at Paragraph 64 states that "*..permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available to improve the character and quality of an area..*". Design is particularly important in the ASLC, first designated in the HUDP. Policy HE1 of the HLP seeks to conserve and enhance the ASLC whilst policy BE5 of the HUDP requires development to harmonise with design features and architectural style predominating in the area.
9. The positioning, scale and form of the proposed side extension for the reasons given above would fail to meet these national and local policy objectives and would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding ASLC.
10. Regarding the proposals for the porch, the alterations would not result in any significantly greater degree of projection and there would be no increase in height. The design proposed would reflect the style of the front elevation to the house.

11. I accept that, in respect of the porch, detail on the submitted plans is limited. However there is enough information to conclude that the impact would be acceptable and a condition requiring matching materials could be imposed.
12. This element of the proposal would be clearly severable both physically and functionally from the proposed extension works. I will, therefore, issue a split decision allowing the appeal insofar as it relates to the porch alterations but dismissing it in relation to the extension.

Other Matters

13. I accept that the appellant, in proposing the extension, would be seeking to make sustainable and effective use of his home, an objective which is encouraged by the Framework. However, this would not outweigh the harm to character and appearance set out above. The proposal, by introducing additions to the property that would be out of keeping with the surrounding area, would not achieve a positive improvement to the built environment and therefore it would not be sustainable development in the terms of the Framework.

Conditions and Conclusion

14. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against the advice in the *Planning Practice Guidance* and for their clarity. In respect of the porch element, a condition requiring development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans is necessary as this provides certainty that the development would be carried out in the form proposed. Control is also required to ensure use of matching materials in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the property and of the surroundings.
15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed in relation to the side and rear extension. However, in relation to the front porch alterations, the appeal should succeed and planning permission be granted.

P. D. Biggers

INSPECTOR