

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 October 2016

**by Roy Merrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 27 October 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3155751**

**32 Montague Road, Uxbridge, Hillingdon UB8 1QL**

- 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 Ann-Marie Elkins against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref 16872/APP/2016/847, dated 8 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2016.
  - The development proposed is a first floor side extension and conversion of garage to habitable use involving alterations to elevations.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension and conversion of garage to habitable use involving alterations to elevations at 32 Montague Road, Uxbridge, Hillingdon UB8 1QL in accordance with the application Ref 16872/APP/2016/847, dated 8 March 2016 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 the following approved plans: MR-01; MR-02.
  - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the North Uxbridge Area of Special Local Character (ASLC).

### Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated in a street corner location, siding onto Grove Road, within a relatively densely developed residential area. The area is characterised by mainly two storey dwellings in a variety of architectural styles with hipped roofs along narrow streets. The site is a short walking distance to
-

the north-east of Uxbridge town centre. Although the Council has referred to the appeal site being within the ASLC, no detailed information regarding the reason for the designation of this area has been provided. It seems to me that the significance of the area lies in the form and appearance of buildings and their relationship with the street.

4. The Council's Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions 2008 (HDAS) contains design guidance regarding two storey side extensions. It states that the Council will normally seek to retain a gap of one metre between the dwelling and the side boundary of the plot, and a greater gap where there is already a single storey side extension within a metre of the boundary. However in relation to corner plots it states that a relaxation of this requirement may be considered where the openness of the corner plot would be maintained and where the return building line is not breached.
5. In this case the proposed extension would project to the side boundary. The question is therefore to what extent it would maintain the openness of the corner plot and respect any return building lines along Grove Road.
6. The curve of Grove Road beyond the rear boundary of the appeal site means that the forward building line of dwellings after this point projects beyond the side boundary line of the site. Accordingly the proposal would not interrupt any strong sense of uniform building line along Grove Road. This absence of a strong return building line is reinforced on the opposite side of Grove Road where the three storey building at No 1, projects forward of the side of No 40 Montague Road.
7. In terms of context, the existing single storey garage of the appeal site already extends to the side boundary of the plot and the front of the extension would be markedly set back from the main elevation of the dwelling. Furthermore the view along Grove Road from Montague Road is dominated by the tall and imposing side elevation of No 1 which tends to draw the eye. In addition, the gradual upward slope of Montague Road to the north east means that from the higher ground level, views of the side extension would to a degree simply take the place of views of the steep fall in the roof slope at No 2 Grove Way.
8. Whilst there would inevitably be a limited degree of imposition within the void areas around the street corner, I consider the aforementioned factors in combination significantly mitigate any sense of a loss of openness that would be caused by the extension. Furthermore, its hipped design and set back from the front elevation serves to reduce the mass of the roof so that it would not make the side of the dwelling appear cramped and over developed in relation to the street.
9. The limited width of the extension and its set back from the front elevation, whilst incorporating a lower ridgeline to the roof, would also ensure that it appeared subordinate to the main dwelling.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the original dwelling or the ASLC. It would therefore accord with Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part One Strategic Policies 2012 and Policies BE5, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies 2012 insofar as they seek to promote good design that protects local character and harmonises with

its surroundings. The development would also, taking into account the specific context of the site, be consistent with the HDAS which seeks to maintain the openness of corner plots whilst ensuring that return building lines are not breached.

**Conditions and Conclusion**

11. For the above reasons, and having considered all other points raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed and planning permission be granted.
12. Conditions specifying the plans and requiring details to be agreed of the materials to be used in the external surfaces of the extension are needed to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

*Roy Merrett*

INSPECTOR