



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2019

by Chris Forrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Friday, 16 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/19/3226512
65 Delamere Road, Hayes UB4 0NN

- 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 Arora & Co against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 51424/APP/2018/4235, dated 30 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 5 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - i. whether the proposal would comply with the spatial strategy of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the Local Plan in terms of minimising flood risk; and
 - ii. the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Flood risk

3. The appeal development would result in an increase in the amount of building coverage at the site when compared to the existing development. The appellant has submitted a document titled 'flood report' with the appeal submission which indicates that the appeal site is located within Flood Zone 2 (as defined by the Environment Agency) which means that the site has a medium probability of flooding.
4. The National Planning Policy Framework¹ (the Framework) outlines that a site-specific flood risk assessment is required for proposals located within Flood Zone 2. Whilst the flood report provides some detail on how the appeal development would be protected from flooding, it does not provide sufficient details to enable me to conclude that the occupiers of the development would not be subjected to an unacceptable flood risk. Furthermore, it does not

¹ At footnote 50 relating to paragraph 163

provide any information on whether the development would unacceptably increase flood risk elsewhere.

5. In the absence of such information I am therefore unable to conclude that the development would not have an adverse impact on flood risk, either for the occupiers of the development or in relation to increased flood risk elsewhere.
6. For the above reasons the proposals has failed to provide sufficient information to demonstrate that the proposal would not cause an unacceptable flood risk contrary to the aims of objectives of the Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance and Policy EM6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan : Part One Strategic Policies (2012) (HLP), saved Policies OE7 and OE8 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (1998) (HUDP) and Policy 5.12 of the London Plan (2016) which amongst other matters seek to manage flood risk including increased flood risk elsewhere and the provision of flood protection measures.

Character and appearance

7. The appeal site is located on the north eastern corner of Uxbridge Road and Delamere Road and consists of one half of a two-storey hipped roof building with a single storey flat roofed projection at the rear. There is also a canopy between the side of the existing rear projection and the side boundary with a service road to Uxbridge Road. The attached property (63 Delamere Road) also has a large flat roofed rear projection. Given the corner position of the site, and the rising level of Uxbridge Road towards the canal overbridge, there are clear views of the appeal site and the existing flat roofed rear projection.
8. The appeal proposal would result in a larger flat roofed rear projection, both in terms of its width and its level of projection from the rear of the two-storey element to the host building.
9. Whilst the design and size of the extension is not proportionate to the original building, it is not dissimilar to the existing situation and would have similar visual impacts on the host building and the area as a whole. To that end, the development would respect the existing character of the area, especially when the existing rear projections at both the appeal property and No 63 are taken into account. Taking those projections into account the appeal proposal would not be of an excessive scale, bulk, height or depth.
10. In coming to that view, I acknowledge that the proposal would result in an extension which would be almost the full width of the site and would be broadly level with the exposed flank wall of the main part of the building. However, in this case, I consider that this would not give rise to any significant harm to the host building, or the wider area, over and above the existing situation.
11. Additionally, I consider that the removal of the existing canopy and its replacement with an enlarged building would provide a positive benefit to the host building and the wider area.
12. For the above reasons the development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and would accord with Policy BE1 of the HLP and Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the HUDP which amongst other matters seek to ensure that all new development should improve and maintain the quality of the built environment and that it harmonise with the existing streetscene.

Conclusion

13. Taking all matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR