
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2016

by Christa Masters MA (hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18th November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3159902

1 Belgrave Mews, Uxbridge, Hillingdon UB8 3AG

- 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 Lumniji Beqiri against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 50419/APP/2016/1050, dated 12 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is 2 storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property represents an end of terrace dwelling in an established residential area. The existing terrace has a uniform appearance in terms of both its scale, design and roof treatment. The host property and the neighbouring property are recessed back slightly from the established building line along the terrace.
 4. The development plan policies which have been referred to include policies BE1, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (LP) 2012. Policy BE1 is a general policy relating to the built environment. It advises, amongst other things that all new development should achieve a high quality design which enhances local distinctiveness. Policy BE13 advises that development will not be permitted if the layout or appearance fails to harmonise with the existing street scene. Policy BE15 states that extensions to existing buildings will be permitted where they harmonise with the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the original building. Furthermore, policy BE19 advises, amongst other things, that new development within residential areas should complement or improve the character of the area.
 5. The appeal proposal represents a two storey side extension of significant width. It would introduce a bulky feature in this prominent corner plot location. As a result of the design of the roof proposed, the extension would be entirely at odds with the established roof treatment along the terrace which is simple in design. It would therefore fail to enhance local distinctiveness as required by
-

policy BE1 as well as the broader objectives identified above in relation to policies BE13 and BE15.

6. In addition, I have also had regard to the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document, Residential Extensions (SPD) 2008. This document advises at paragraph 5.1 that in relation to side extensions, all residential extensions should be set back a minimum of 1 metre from the side boundary of the property. This is order to protect the character and appearance of the street scene. The Council have advised the proposal would fail to meet this distance. In my estimations, I am also of the view that the proposal would be positioned close to the side boundary of the property and would as a result represent a bulky addition to the property. This would cause material harm to the host property and street scene.
7. The appellant states the site is screened by existing trees and shrubs which would obscure the extension. Be that as it may, in the circumstances of this appeal, I am not convinced that screening an uncharacteristic development is a sound approach.
8. I therefore conclude the proposal would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with policies BE1, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the LP as well as the SPD outlined above.

Other matters

9. A number of third parties have raised concerns regarding the potential use of the dwelling as a HMO, as well as additional concerns relating to the effect of the proposal on parking and refuse as well as the effect on trees. However, the proposal before me relates to a householder extension and I have accordingly assessed the proposal as such. The Council have confirmed that adequate parking can be provided in accordance with the development plan policy. The appellant has specified that no trees would be affected by the development and I have no reason to disagree with this statement. I am also satisfied that adequate refuse collection arrangements could be made at the site.
10. Concerns have also been expressed in terms of the potential effect of the proposal on the living conditions of No 29 Orchard Drive. However, taking into account the separation distances involved, I am not convinced the proposal would result in any material harm in this regard. On balance, none of these additional concerns, either individually or collectively would lead me to reach a different view on the main issue before me.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Christa Masters

INSPECTOR