
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 June 2020

by Andrew Bremford BSc (Hons) MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3244418
25 Norton Road, Uxbridge UB8 2PT

- 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 Jackman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 19982/APP/2019/3137, dated 24 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension and alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for single storey rear extension and alterations at 25 Norton Road, Uxbridge UB8 2PT, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19982/APP/2019/3137, dated 24 September 2019, 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: 1:1250 site location plan 'OS Plan B&W'; 'Proposed Single Storey Rear Extension and Alterations' 4237/01A; and 'Proposed Elevations and Site Plan' 4237/02B.
 - 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.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above and my formal decision has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original planning application form.
3. The Council's refusal notice refers to Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the emerging London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies (LPP2). Since the application was determined the Council has now adopted, on the 16 January 2020, the LPP2.

On this basis I afford the aforementioned policies of the LPP2 full weight in my consideration of this appeal.

4. In their refusal notice, the Council has referred to Policies BE4, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 – Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) (LP) as reasons for refusal. However, as noted above, the Council has now adopted the LPP2 which replaces the LP. Hence, although the Council's refusal notice refers to the LP policies, they are no longer relevant to the determination of this appeal.
5. In their refusal notice, the Council has also referred to Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions (SPD) as a reason for refusal. However, the Council has confirmed, in a policy update, that the SPD has been withdrawn. Hence, although the Council's refusal notice refers to the SPD, it is no longer relevant to the determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area, and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Greenway Conservation Area.

Reasons

7. The appeal property is the left-hand half of a pair of semi-detached two storey houses located on the south side of Norton Road. The house is an attractive traditional yellow 'London stock' brick property with a slate roof and a canted, double storey bay window to the front. Attached to its side (east) elevation and set back a little from the front elevation of the property is a garage with a shallow mono-pitched roof. There is an aluminium framed conservatory attached to the rear elevation of the two storey rear outrigger. Moreover, there is a store and WC at ground floor level with a shallow mono-pitched roof attached to the side elevation of the outrigger. The side elevation of this structure is set in a little from the main side elevation of the property.
8. The site lies within a mainly residential area characterised by mostly terraced rows and semi-detached dwellings that are of a similar size, design and form. The properties are set back from the road and have either a front garden or off-road parking or a combination of both. The site lies within the Greenway Conservation Area (GCA) and as such I have a statutory duty under section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. The southern boundary of the rear garden of the appeal site lies on the southern boundary of the GCA, beyond which is dense foliage within part of the grounds of Brunel University.
9. A Conservation Area Appraisal for the GCA has not been presented to me. However, from the evidence before me, and from what I have observed, I conclude that the significance of the GCA derives, in part, from the uniformly aligned streets of predominantly Victorian terraced rows and semi-detached residential properties interspersed with detached buildings, the design and architectural quality of the buildings, and their materials. The appeal property, by virtue of it having maintained much of its traditional character and features, makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the GCA and thus the significance of the heritage asset.

10. The proposal seeks to remove the conservatory and erect a single storey rear extension and carry out alterations to the side elevation. In effect, the result of the proposed development would be to form a 'wrap around' side and rear single storey extension.
11. The alterations to the side elevation would result in a long length of unbroken wall down the side of the outrigger as a result of bricking up the existing openings and extending the property to the rear. However, the footprint of the existing store and WC would be subsumed into the development and although the width of the proposed rear extension would be greater than that of the existing two storey outrigger, the development would not extend the built form beyond the main side elevation of the house, nor indeed beyond the side elevation of the existing store and WC. Consequently, notwithstanding the 'wrap around' configuration of the proposal the substantive L-form shape of the house would be maintained by virtue of the two storey element of the building.
12. Policy DMHD 1 of the LPP2 states, amongst other things, that single storey rear extensions on semi-detached houses where the plot width is 5.0 metres or more (as in this case) should not exceed 3.6 metres. The submitted plans indicate that the depth of the proposed rear extension would be 3.7 metres, thus the proposal, in this regard, would technically breach the policy. The policy also states that flat roofed single storey rear extensions should not exceed 3.0 metres in height and in Conservation Areas will be expected to be finished with a parapet. The proposed rear extension would have a maximum height of 3.0 metres and the flat roof would be finished on two sides with parapet walls, therefore, in this regard, would adhere to the policy.
13. Whilst the depth of the proposed single storey rear extension would be marginally greater than 3.6 metres, when viewed from the rear, taking into account the overall modest scale of the proposed development, it would not represent a disproportionate addition that would unduly detract from the character or appearance of the original form of the host building. Overall, the size and design of the proposal, and the architectural detailing to include parapet wall finishes to the flat roof, would not erode the traditional character of the property.
14. Taking into account its position and scale, and the presence of the attached garage, the proposal would not be readily visible from the public domain in views from Norton Road. Thus, the proposal would not have a harmful impact on the streetscene in views from within the GCA. As a result, the development would not detract from the character and appearance of the street scene or the wider GCA, nor would it harm the key qualities of the GCA which includes the visual and architectural richness of the residential properties.
15. The proposed roof lights would be completely flush to reduce intrusion and so I find no harm in respect of this element of the proposal. I note that the Council raised no objection to this element of the proposed development either.
16. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building or the surrounding area. Furthermore, the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the GCA and not harm its significance.
17. Accordingly, the proposed development would not conflict with Policies BE1 and HE1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies

(November 2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4 and DMHB 11 of the LPP2, and Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2016) which, amongst other things, seek to ensure development proposals achieve a high quality of design, respect and harmonise with the distinctiveness of existing development in the surrounding area, and preserve the significance of heritage assets by being sympathetic to their form, scale and architectural detail. In addition, although it would technically breach part of Policy DMHD 1 of the LPP2, it would accord with its general aims.

Conditions

18. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three-year time limit condition. It is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. I have therefore imposed a condition to this effect. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, it is necessary to impose a materials condition.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Andrew Bremford

INSPECTOR