



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2020

by Jan Hebblethwaite MA Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3249226

2 Parkway, Uxbridge UB10 9JX

- 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 Dennis Dunne against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon Council.
 - The application Ref 24601/APP/2020/14 dated 4 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 February 2020.
 - The development proposed comprises part two storey, part single storey rear extension, front extension, conversion of garage to habitable use and the raising and enlargement of roof to allow for habitable roof space.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The description of the proposed development in the application form was as set out above. The description of the development on the Council's decision notice was different:

Part two storey, part single storey rear extension, part two storey, part single storey front extension, conversion of garage to habitable use and raising of roof to allow for conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 6 roof lights.

Although there is an apparently notable difference in relation to the description of the front extension, both parties refer to a slight enlargement of the corner element at first floor level. On that basis I am satisfied that the description set out in the decision notice covers the development shown on the plans submitted with the application and this appeal.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for part two storey, part single storey rear extension, part two storey, part single storey front extension, conversion of garage to habitable use and raising of roof to allow for conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 6 roof lights at 2 Parkway, Uxbridge UB10 9JX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24601/APP/2020/14 dated 4 January 2020, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions set out in the Schedule at the end of this decision letter.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this decision is the effect of the proposed development on the host property, and on the character and appearance of the street scene and the Area of Special Character.

Reasons

4. The host property fronts Parkway close to its junction with Long Lane, where there is a medical centre. Parkway is residential in character, with mainly detached houses in generous plots and with a wide variety of styles and designs.
5. A previous permission¹ was granted in November 2019 for a similar development to that proposed, but without the front extension now included in the application the subject of this appeal. The decision notice indicates that the proposed development is unacceptable by reason of the front extension. It is clear from the officer's report that all other elements of the proposed development are acceptable. I agree.
6. The existing configuration of the host property is an "L" shape, with the front entrance at the angle. The proposal includes an extension inside the angle at ground floor with a small enlargement over the porch above the entrance. The effect would be to reduce the space inside the "L".
7. There is no uniformity of style or design of the houses in Parkway. Whilst the host property is unique in the sense that there is no other like it, to a large extent, all the properties on the same side of Parkway are unique. Whilst the proposed front extension would reduce the space on the inside of the "L", it would not have the effect of squaring off the property. Part of the front elevation would still be behind the line of the forwardmost wall and would appear subordinate to that part of the dwelling. Although the proposed extension would change the appearance of the host property, it would not be of such a scale and bulk which would be dominant and for that reason I do not consider that the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (November 2012) ("HLP1") which deals with the built environment.
8. The host property is within the Hillingdon Court Park Area of Special Local Character ("ASLC"). This part of the ASLC is characterised by detached houses in large plots of varying styles, several of which have been extended. Policy HE1 of HLP1 deal with Hillingdon's heritage which the Council seeks to conserve and enhance. Policy DMHB5 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies ("HLP2") requires that extensions to buildings should be subservient to and respect the architectural style of the original building. The extensions to the host property are not of such a scale that they detract from the ASLC and as I have found above, are not of such a scale that they dominate the host property. Therefore, there is no conflict with Policies HE1 or DMHB5.
9. The host property is set well back in the plot from the street. The front extension would be visible from the street but in view of the size of the front garden, would not appear overbearing or dominant in the street scene. I do

¹ 24601/APP/2019/2562

not consider there to be a conflict with Policy DHMHB11 or 12 of the HLP2 in relation to design and the street scene.

10. Policy DMHD1 of the HLP2 deals with extensions to residential dwellings and requires that front extensions do not extend across the entire frontage. The proposed front extension is to only part of the front elevation and as I have found above, would not dominate the front elevation or the street scene. I do not consider that there is a conflict with this Policy

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and taking all material planning considerations into account, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed. In addition to the standard three-year time limit for commencement, I have imposed a condition requiring development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the interests of certainty. I have however added a condition which requires the external finishes and materials to be approved by the Council in the interests of character and appearance. The remaining conditions are as imposed on the previously granted planning permission for the development other than the front extension, in the interests of consistency.

Jan Hebblethwaite

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
2. Subject to condition 3, the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: A488-SK1; A488-P-01; A488-P-02; a488-p-05E and A488-P-06E.
3. Prior to commencement of development and notwithstanding the plans submitted with the application, details of the materials and finishes to be used on the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
4. The first floor side windows facing 4 Parkway and 261 Long Lane and the first floor rear dressing room window shall be glazed with permanently obscured glass to at least scale 4 on the Pilkington scale and be non-opening below a height of 1.8 metres taken from internal finished floor level for so long as the development remains in existence.
5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional windows, doors or other openings shall be constructed in the walls or roof slopes of the development hereby approved facing 4 Parkway or 261 Long Lane.

6. Access to the flat roof over the extension hereby approved shall be for maintenance or emergency purposes only and the flat roof shall not be used as a roof garden, terrace, balcony, patio or similar amenity area.
7. Trees, hedges and shrubs shown to be retained on the approved plan(s) shall not be damaged, uprooted, felled, lopped or topped without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority. If any retained tree, hedge or shrub is removed or severely damaged during (or after) construction, or is found to be seriously diseased or dying, another tree, hedge or shrub shall be planted at the same place or, if planting in the same place would leave the new tree, hedge or shrub susceptible to disease, then the planting should be in a position to be first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority and shall be of a size and species to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall be planted in the first planting season following the completion of the development or the occupation of the buildings, whichever is the earlier. Where damage is less severe, a schedule of remedial works necessary to ameliorate the effect of damage by tree surgery, feeding or groundwork shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. New planting should comply with BS 3936 (1992) 'Nursery Stock, Part 1, Specification for Trees and Shrubs.' Remedial work should be carried out to BS 3998:2010 'Tree work - Recommendations' and BS 4428 (1989) 'Code of Practice for General Landscape Operations (Excluding Hard Surfaces)'. The agreed work shall be completed in the first planting season following the completion of the development or the occupation of the buildings, whichever is the earlier.