

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2017

by Martin H Seddon BSc DipTP MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 6th April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3166910
52 Harlington Road, Uxbridge, UB8 3EX

- 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 Pardeep Gill against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref: 9995/APP/2016/3966 was refused by notice dated 20 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is: first floor hipped roof side extension and conversion of garage to habitable use.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The Council has raised no objections to the garage conversion. I see no reason to disagree as the design would be acceptable and there would be sufficient parking space remaining on the driveway. There would also be no harm to the living conditions of neighbours from loss of light, loss of privacy or outlook. The main issue is the effect of the proposed first floor extension on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. No.52 Harlington Road is a two storey semi-detached house located within a residential area. It abuts the boundary of the Hillingdon Village Conservation Area and the boundary of Bishophalt School, which is grade II listed. The building has been previously extended to create a single storey flat roofed garage, alongside the boundary with number 54 Harlington Road. No.50 Harlington Road, the adjoining semi-detached house to No.52 has not been extended. Apart from the garage at No.52, the pair of semi-detached houses have retained their symmetry in design.
4. This part of Harlington Road is characterised by semi-detached and single storey dwellings, separated by gaps of around 1m to 1.5m in width. This provides a degree of spaciousness between the properties when viewed from Harlington Road. The Council considers that the extension at first floor level will close the gap between the appeal dwelling and No.54 (which has a different design). The appeal dwelling has already been extended to its boundary with No.54, with the existing gap between the two dwellings being around 1.3m within the curtilage of No.54. I agree with the appellant that it appears impracticable for No.54 to extend towards No.52 to create a terracing effect at first floor level because of the limited space available. Despite this, I consider

that the proposed extension would significantly reduce the gap between Nos.52 and 54 at first floor level and would erode the sense of spaciousness, to the detriment of the street scene.

5. The proposed first floor extension would be set back from the front elevation of the dwelling and its roof height would be lower than the existing ridge line. However, the proposed extension would conflict with paragraph 5.1 of the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document: *Residential Extensions*. This specifies that where there is an existing single storey side extension within 1m of the boundary, a first floor extension should be set in by a minimum of 1.5m. Although this is only guidance, policy BE22 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Saved Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Policies also indicates that extensions two or more storeys in height should be set back a minimum of 1m from the side boundary. I consider that the Council's supplementary guidance is applicable in the context of the character and appearance of residential development in this part of Harlington Road.
6. The proposal would contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies which requires extensions to achieve a high quality of design which enhances local distinctiveness. There would also be conflict with saved UDP policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 which generally seek to ensure that extensions harmonise with existing development and improve the character of the area.

Other Considerations

7. The appellant claims that the UDP and supplementary planning document are out of date and has referred to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), including paragraphs 9, 57 and 186. He submits that the proposal would improve the family's living space and living conditions. On that basis, he believes that the proposal would represent sustainable development and meet the requirements of the Framework. However, there are relevant development plan policies which are consistent with the Framework. Moreover, even if no up-to-date policies applied, I consider that the adverse impacts from the proposed first floor extension on the character and appearance of the street scene would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

Conclusion

8. I have taken all other matters raised into account. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR