



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 September 2020

by B Davies MSc FGS CGeol

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3247231

48 Edinburgh Drive, Ickenham, Uxbridge, UB10 8QY

- 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 M Hancock against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 16847/APP/2019/2921, dated 2 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey outbuilding in the rear garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey outbuilding in the rear garden at 48 Edinburgh Drive, Ickenham, Uxbridge, UB10 8QY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16847/APP/2019/2921, dated 2 September 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 'Location Plan' 201914/LP/01, 'Block Plan' 201914/PL/101, 'Building Plan' 201914/PL/102(A).
 - 2) The building hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as number 48 Edinburgh Drive, Ickenham, Uxbridge, UB10 8QY.

Preliminary matters

2. It has been necessary to change the description of the development from that on the application form to remove the word 'retrospective', which is not a description of development.
3. The policies relied upon at the point that planning permission was refused have since been replaced by Policies DMHB11 and DMHD2 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020) (the 'LP'). The Council's Supplementary Planning Document, the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions (December 2008) has also been withdrawn.

Main issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host house and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is at the rear of the garden behind an extended, semi-detached dwelling on a large housing estate. The original garage and small extension to this can be seen to the rear side of the house, and a lawned area and yard fills the remaining rear space. The Council consider that the remaining garden is of sufficient size for the type of dwelling, with which I concur. The outbuilding had already been substantially completed by the time of the site visit.
6. Policy DMHD2 of the LP requires that the footprint of development must be proportionate to that of the dwelling house and to the residential curtilage in which it stands. The policy does not state that it should only apply to the original footprint of the house, so I have considered the size of the structure in the context of the extended house, the footprint of which the appellant calculates is 74 m². The structure has a footprint of 42 m² and is therefore more than half of the house footprint. It is also significantly larger than the 'general rule' set out in the supporting text to the policy of a maximum 30m².
7. However, notwithstanding that this is indisputably a large outbuilding when compared to the footprint of the dwelling, in appearance I did not find it to be disproportionate to the house at the site visit. Being situated at the bottom of the long garden, the outbuilding is not easily viewed in the same frame as the main building, which precludes direct comparison of the footprint and prevents domination of the house. The outbuilding is of single storey construction with a flat roof, which also minimises the sense of bulk. A good-sized garden remains, and by virtue of this, neither did the development appear disproportionate to the residential curtilage.
8. The appeal site is not visible from the public domain at the front of the house. High fences separated the rear gardens and mature trees partly screen fleeting views of the site from the overground train to the rear. I am therefore satisfied that the structure would not be visually obtrusive in the wider area.
9. The appellant has provided aerial photos that suggest large outbuildings at the rear of gardens are reasonably common in the area. They have also provided a photo that shows a large extension in a similar position at No 52. Although unable to observe these directly at the site visit, on the balance of probability I am satisfied that large outbuildings are not unusual locally. However, I do not have further information regarding the status of these structures, which limits the weight that I can give to this evidence.
10. In conclusion, while the outbuilding is larger than the guidelines recommend, it is not visually obtrusive, nor does it dominate the host building. In addition, it appears likely that such structures are not uncommon in the area. I therefore do not find the development will conflict with Policies DMHD2 and DMHB11, which aim to secure proportionate development that does not harm local character and appearance.

Conditions

11. The commencement condition is not considered necessary as the development has already taken place, but a condition to secure accordance with the approved plans is necessary in the interests of good planning. I have also imposed a condition recommended by the Council to ensure that the building is used for ancillary purposes in the future.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be allowed.

B Davies

INSPECTOR