

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2020 by S Witherley

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3249600
46 Floriston Avenue, Uxbridge UB10 9DZ

- 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 Steve Pocock against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 15365/APP/2019/3659, dated 10 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 January 2020.
 - The development proposed as described on the application form is: Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension at 46 Floriston Avenue, Uxbridge UB10 9DZ, in accordance with the terms of application Ref 15365/APP/2019/3659, dated 10 November 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 development, hereby permitted, shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan (1:1250) - received 10 Nov 2019, P-EL06 Rev. D - received 10 Nov 2019, P-PS05 Rev. D - received 10 Nov 2019.
 - 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.

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.

Preliminary Matter

3. There is a discrepancy between the submitted existing and proposed floor plans for the proposal in respect of the position of the appeal building in relation to the common boundary with the access track to the side. From my observations I noted that the existing single storey side addition sat adjacent to the common boundary and not slightly offset as shown on the existing floor plans. The effect is that the proposed ground floor of the two-storey extension would sit along
-

this existing line as shown on the proposed plan. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

4. Since the appeal was submitted, the London Borough of Hillingdon, Local Plan Part 2, Development Management Policies (LP2) was adopted on 16 January 2020. As such, Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (2012), cited in the refusal reason along with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, Residential Extensions, have been withdrawn and are no longer part of the development plan. The relevant policies are those which are in place at the time the appeal decision is made, and, in that respect, I shall refer to Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the LP2 in making my recommendation. These were cited on the Council's decision notice as emerging planning policies. As such, the parties are familiar with the content of the relevant policies and have had the opportunity to comment on them and no prejudice will arise as a result of my decision to base the report on the basis of the adopted policies.

Main issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal property is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling located in a suburban road characterised by short terraces which follow a distinct building line. Most properties have projecting floor to eave front windows with a short mono pitched canopy over a recessed front door, with a number of alterations present.
7. The proposal would replace an existing single storey side and rear extension with a wrap around one and two-storey side and rear extension.
8. The proposed two-storey side element would be built adjacent to the common boundary at ground floor and stepped in slightly at first floor with the front retaining the existing building line and mono pitched canopy. This canopy would be tied into a mono pitched roof that would wrap around the side and rear thus presenting a more cohesive development than the existing incremental extensions. Whilst the first-floor addition would be flush with the existing front elevation it would be set back behind the canopy which would help to break up the mass of the structure.
9. As a result of the proposal's design, scale and mass the existing rhythm and scale of development along the front elevation of the appeal property and the terrace block as a whole would be retained. As the roof would be tied in with the original hipped roof this would further help in reducing its overall visual impact and would prevent the extension from appearing as an overly dominant or bulky addition within the wider streetscape. Whilst it is often good practice to set back first floor side extensions and to lower the ridgeline to create a subservient appearance there are valid design reasons for taking a different approach in this instance. The design of the wrap around canopy would create the appearance of a subservient upper floor; the hipped roof would be consistent with the arrangement of the row as a whole; and the proposal would bring a more coherent design than the existing extensions.

10. Furthermore, the access track between the side extension and the neighbouring dwelling at No. 48 would be retained. That break in the building line would prevent any terracing effect and ensure that the resulting extension would not represent an over development of the plot when viewed from the road.
11. The two-storey rear element would have a projecting gable covering part of the rear elevation. It would sit adjacent to the common boundary and offset from the shared boundary with No. 44. As a result of the sloping planes of the projecting gable, its perceived height on either boundary would be reduced with its design and scale complementing elements of the main dwelling without it appearing dominant or out of proportion to the existing. Whilst the single storey element would extend out into the rear garden beyond the footprint of the existing single storey extension, this would not be to a degree that it would create an overly dominant structure or be out of scale with the overall proposal or original dwelling.
12. Whilst the proposal would represent a significant increase in the size of the appeal property, I consider that its overall design, scale and mass would be in with keeping the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace block as a whole and the wider locality.
13. The proposal would not therefore cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. The proposal is found to be in accordance with Policy BE1 of A Vision for 2026 Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the LP2 which seek development to be of a high quality design in keeping with the character of the original property and the surrounding area and this is consistent with the National Planning Policy Frameworks core principle of securing high quality design.

Other Matters

14. Neither party have addressed any third-party objections, however, I note that an objection was received from the Oak Farm Residents' Association who raised matters relating to the character and appearance of the proposal which I have addressed above. In addition, they also raised matters relating to the area been identified as a critical drainage and flood area, however, no evidence has been provided regarding this and the Council have not raised any objection in respect to this matter.
15. In regard to their concern regarding previous development which they think would set a precedent each application is considered on its own individual merits, furthermore, no specific examples have been submitted of these previous developments and a generalised concern of this nature would not justify withholding permission on this basis.

Conditions

16. I have imposed the standard time limit condition and have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. A condition is necessary for the materials to match those that are used in the existing property to maintain the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

S Witherley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, agree that the appeal should be allowed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR