
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2017

by Stephen Hawkins MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3168871
6 Connaught Close, Uxbridge UB8 3DZ

- 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 Viran Khanna against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 71470/APP/2016/3595, dated 27 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side, single storey rear and part first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension at 6 Connaught Close, Uxbridge UB8 3DZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 71470/APP/2016/3595, dated 27 September 2016, 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: 15/6/CVH/101, 15/6/CVH/102, 16/6/CCH/103A, 16/6/CCH/104A & location plan.
 - 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.
 - 4) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the window at first floor level on the side elevation, shown on drawing numbers 16/6/CCH/103A and 16/6/CCH/104A has been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of that window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Details of the type of obscured glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the window is installed and once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.

Procedural Matter

2. The description in the banner heading has been taken from the application form. However, in section E of the appeal form the appellant states that the description has changed. The revised description matches that used on the Council's decision notice. I am satisfied that the revised description does not
-

prejudice any of the parties to the appeal and I have therefore used it in my formal decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a modern semi-detached dwelling. The dwelling is situated in a small close, mostly made up of well-spaced pairs of similar dwellings arranged around a communal turning head. The wider suburban area comprises residential properties of a mix of ages and styles.
5. Part of the proposal consists of a two storey side extension. This would replace a utilitarian garage which forms part of a range of low outbuildings situated adjacent to the angled boundary with 7 Connaught Close (No 7).
6. The side extension would have a similar form and appearance to the dwelling. It would be set back around 2.5 metres from the front elevation of the dwelling and it would have a lower roof line. As a result, the side extension would be of a scale and design that would appear as a subservient addition to the dwelling.
7. The above factors together with the angled, set back siting of the dwelling in relation to No 7, would have the effect that the side extension would be open to limited views from the close. For the most part, there would only be a partial view of the side extension, which would be recessed in relation to the front elevation of the dwelling. The angle of view would further limit the apparent width of the side extension. Therefore, the side extension would not intrude significantly on the field of view afforded by the existing space between the side of the dwelling and No 7. As a result, the side extension would not significantly erode the existing sense of space between the dwelling and No 7. Nor would it create a more enclosed feel in the street scene or appear cramped in relation to the surrounding development.
8. The Council's adopted 'Residential Extensions' Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) section 5, requires two storey extensions to, amongst other matters, be set back at least a metre from the side boundary. This is to accord with saved Policy BE22 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (UDP). The submitted plans do not show the distance from the side extension to the boundary with No 7. The existing garage currently occupies all of the space between the dwelling and the side boundary. Even so, the side extension would be of limited width in comparison with the progressively widening distance between the side of the dwelling and the boundary with No 7. Consequently, in my estimation no part of the side extension would be closer than a metre to the boundary. In other respects, the side extension would be consistent with the SPD guidance.
9. The proposal would also involve continuing the side extension to the rear of the dwelling at two storeys. This extension would be similar in terms of its form and design to the dwelling and it would not exceed the size and other guidelines for such extensions to semi-detached properties set out in the SPD at section 6. At just over 4.5 metres, the proposed single storey rear extension would exceed the depth of such extensions advised in the SPD in section 3. However, its depth would be similar to an existing rear extension at

5 Connaught Close. There would be very limited views in respect of this part of the proposal from the public realm. The Council had no objection to the rear extensions and I have found no reason to disagree with them in those respects.

10. Taking all of the above into account, the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, the proposal would accord with Policy BE1 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1-Strategic Policies, as it would improve and maintain the quality of the built environment by achieving a high quality of design, enhancing the local distinctiveness of the area in terms of its form, scale and materials.
11. The proposal would accord with saved UDP Policy BE13, as its appearance would harmonise with the existing street scene. It would also accord with saved UDP Policy BE15, as the proposal would harmonise with the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the original building. Further, the proposal would accord with saved UDP Policy BE19, as it would complement the amenity and character of the area. The distance from the side boundary would accord with saved UDP Policy BE22. The proposal would also be consistent with the SPD, by protecting the character and appearance of the street scene and the gaps between properties.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard commencement condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans in the interests of certainty. To ensure a harmonious appearance, I have imposed a condition requiring the external materials of the development to match those of the dwelling. After seeking the views of both main parties, I have also imposed a condition requiring the window on the side elevation at first floor level to be obscure glazed and largely incapable of being opened, in order to safeguard the privacy of the occupiers of the adjoining residential property.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Stephen Hawkins

INSPECTOR