
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2017

by A A Phillips BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16 January 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/17/3179389

97 and 99 Misbourne Road, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB10 0HP

- 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 Loubon and Mr Treacy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 72623/APP/2017/711, dated 3 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is a part two storey, part single storey rear extension to both properties and a two storey side/rear extension to No. 97.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have taken the description of the development from the Council's decision notice rather than the application form because it more accurately describes the proposal before me.
3. I have noted the local planning authority's policy position statement in its Statement of Case and am aware that the development plan for the Borough comprises the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies adopted November 2012, the extant 2007 Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies adopted November 2012 to serve for an interim period as the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 and the London Plan March 2016.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a pair of two storey semi-detached residential properties situated at the head of a cul-de-sac in a predominantly residential part of Uxbridge. Both properties have been altered and extended in the past with No 97 having a substantial flat roof single storey rear and side extension and No 99 having a large flat roof two storey rear and side extension and a single storey rear extension. Both properties face the highway to the front and have large and particularly long private amenity spaces to the rear. Properties along Misbourne Road in the vicinity of the appeal site are mainly similarly designed two storey semi-detached houses.

6. At my site visit I noted that both properties have extensions that extend beyond the width of the original buildings. The current proposal does not involve extending beyond the width of the existing properties; however, the proposed first floor rear and side extension to No 97 would extend over part of the existing single storey flat roof side/rear extension, the side projection of which can be seen from the front of the property. Consequently, the proposed two storey element would be visible from Misbourne Road. The extension would incorporate materials to match the existing property, would have a much reduced roof ridge and would be set back from the main frontage of the property by the length of the original property. Therefore, although it would extend beyond the width of the original property at No 97 it would be seen as a subservient addition and would not be at all prominent or visually intrusive from the public realm.
7. It is clear to me from the submitted plans that the proposed rear extensions would project more than 3.6 metres from the rear wall of the original properties. It appears to me that the first floor rear extension would protrude by marginally more than 3.6 metres from the rear wall of the original property. Although the appellant contends that over-dominance is not a matter of concern in respect of the proposal and this is common ground between the appellant and the Council I dispute this on the basis that the reason for refusal specifically identifies that the proposal would fail to appear as subordinate additions.
8. Indeed, although I acknowledge that there are existing single storey and two storey side and rear extensions on the existing properties the current proposal for large ground and first floor extensions would, as a consequence of their siting, scale and bulk, dominate the rear of the properties to the detriment of the architectural integrity of the original properties. As such the development would not make a positive contribution to the local area in terms of layout, form and scale. Although there is no harmful effect on the street scene itself, the proposal would be harmful to the integrity of the original properties which have already been compromised by alterations and extensions. The proposal does include some design features which respect the original properties but overall the siting, bulk and massing of the proposal would not harmonise with the host properties.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Policy BE1 of the of the Local Plan Part 1 Strategic Policies Adopted November 2012, Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (adopted 1998) Saved Policies 27 September 2007 and the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions December 2008 (the SPD). Among other objectives these seek to ensure that new development makes a positive contribution to the local area in terms of layout, form and scale, should achieve a high quality design for all new buildings, proposals should not result in inappropriate development that erodes the character of suburban areas and development should complement the amenity and character of the area. The SPD is a material consideration and provides detailed guidance to ensure that the development plan objectives are met.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and taking into account other matters raised I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alastair Phillips

INSPECTOR