



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2020 by Mariam Noorgat BSc (Hons)

Decision by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3235603

12 Andover Close, Uxbridge UB8 2XH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Basaam Aweid against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon Council.
 - The application Ref 74784/APP/2019/1422 dated 26 April 2019 was refused by notice dated 5 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a front extension incorporating garage conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the front extension incorporating garage conversion at 12 Andover Close, Uxbridge UB8 2XH, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 74784/APP/2019/1422, dated 26 April 2019, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Plan, A210, A101+A201, A102+A202, A104+A204, A105+A205, A106+A206, A107+A207, A108+A208 and A209.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. The Council referred to Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan, Saved Policies 27th September 2007 (UDP) and emerging Policy DMHD1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2, Development Management Policies, October 2015 with Main Modifications March 2019, (Local Plan Part 2), within their Decision Notice. The Council have adopted the Local Plan Part 2 since the time of their decision and

confirm Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 are withdrawn. The Council have provided copies of the adopted version of Policy DMHD1 which is similar to the emerging version quoted in the Decision Notice. I have based my decision on the adopted version.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal property forms the left hand half of a pair of two-storey semi-detached houses and the neighbouring property No.10 additionally has a two storey side element. The semi-detached pair are setback from the pavement by a significant distance and both incorporate a garage that protrudes from the front elevation and the main entrance of the house. Although most of the properties within Andover Close share a similar configuration, I witnessed various styles of canopies to front entrances, setback porches, garage conversions to habitable spaces and full width front extensions of varying scales. These additions cumulatively do not provide a strong sense of local distinctiveness and the character and appearance of the area is diverse.
6. The proposed development would not appear bulky or visually intrusive by virtue of its modest size, single storey nature and considerable setback from the pavement. Further, given the various styles and scales of development witnessed on Andover Close, including a full width front extension opposite the appeal property at No.7, regardless of its planning history, the proposed development would not appear incongruous or prominent in the street scene. The Council state the development would fail to harmonise with the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses of which it forms a part, however, given the two-storey side element at No.10, I do not consider there is currently much symmetry to the pair.
7. I acknowledge the Council state the proposal is a full width extension, however, the proposed development would be to the side of the existing garage. Therefore although Policy DHDM1 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, Hillingdon Design and Accessible Statement: Residential Extensions, December 2008, state the Council would not normally allow front extensions, I consider this does not strictly apply.
8. The Council do not raise concerns about the garage conversion to a habitable space. Given the many conversions present within the locality, I have no reason to disagree.
9. Based on the reasoning above, the proposed development would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. I therefore do not find conflict with Policy BE1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan, Part 1, Strategic Policies, Adopted November 2012, (Local Plan Part 1) and Policy DMHD1, which seek to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conditions

10. In the interests of certainty, a condition is necessary to ensure the development is carried in accordance with the approved plans and within three years of the date of this decision. Furthermore, in the interests of the character

and appearance of the area, a condition is necessary to ensure matching materials are used.

Recommendation and Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend the appeal is allowed.

Mariam Noorgat

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR