

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2021

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3263698

88 Collingwood Road, Uxbridge, UB8 3EN

- 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 H Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 28630/APP/2020/2217, dated 15 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side, first floor rear and ground floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side, first floor rear and ground floor rear extension at 88 Collingwood Road, Uxbridge, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 28630/APP/2020/2217, dated 15 July 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than 3 years beginning with the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Site location plan; Proposed floor plans and block plan, drawing 2020/88/CRU/101; and Proposed elevations, drawing 2020/88/CRU/102, in so far as they relate to the approved development only.
 - 3) The materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the works hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Background

3. The Council have described the proposal as a two storey side extension and part two storey part single storey rear extension with alterations to rear elevation. This differs from the description on the application form. As I have no evidence that the revised description has been agreed, I have retained the original description.
-

4. It was evident from my site visit that a rear dormer structure has been erected. Its details differ from those shown on the submitted plans. However, the Council suggest that the structure, as shown, is likely to constitute permitted development. It is not the purpose of these proceedings to determine whether the existing or proposed structure is lawful but given the Council's view, I have considered it on this basis. As the proposal does not include the second floor dormer structure in the description, I have not assessed it as part of the works currently proposed. Whether the current or proposed details of this structure are lawful, is a matter for the Council.
5. A single storey rear extension is in the process of being built on the site. The Council advise that Prior Approval for a 4m deep extension was not required. The current proposal would result in a similar extension on the shared boundary and although it would not represent permitted development, as it would be part of the larger scheme, it would have the same impact on the attached neighbouring property.
6. Overall, no greater harm would result to the living conditions of the adjoining residents as a result of this proposal. I agree with the Council therefore that the only main issue relates to the character and appearance of the area.

Character and appearance

7. The proposal would result in a two storey side extension. This would be set back from the frontage of the property by a metre and would have a lower roof height. A one metre passageway would be retained to the side. I am satisfied that this element of the proposal would have a satisfactory appearance and would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the area.
8. The two storey element to the rear of the side extension would be finished with a hipped roof and would be built in materials to match the main house. It would be set away from the boundary and would be less than half the width of the extended footprint of the house overall. I find this design approach to be satisfactory. There would only be limited views of this element of the proposal but in any event, it would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the property or wider area.
9. The existing rear roof slope is currently dominated by the large dormer structure. The proposed first floor rear element would marginally reduce the dominance of the dormer, in some views, as the new roof would offer some screening of it. Whilst the juxtaposition of the proposed new roof form and the dormer structure would be somewhat contrived, the detail of this arrangement would not be widely visible or noticeable.
10. The size and presence of the dormer does detract from the proportions and appearance of the rear of the property. The dormer is not being considered as part of this proposal. The design of the elements that go beyond the works that are already permitted would achieve a good standard of design and would not, when combined with the existing elements, result in greater harm. The proposal does not therefore conflict with the design aspirations of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies 2012 or Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies 2020. These policies are consistent with the design

aspirations of the National Planning Policy Framework and can be afforded full weight.

Conclusions

11. The two storey works proposed to the side and rear of the dwelling would be of a satisfactory design, form and position in relation to the original dwelling. The single storey element has already been accepted and the dormer structure is understood to represent permitted development. I am satisfied that the currently proposed works would be satisfactory in their own right; and would not increase the harm that already results from the roof structure, should it be found to be lawful. I therefore allow the appeal.
12. I have imposed conditions that refer to the timetable for commencement. I have made reference to the plans and have indicated that the permission relates to the described works rather than the roof extension for the avoidance of doubt. A condition to require that the materials match those of the dwelling is also necessary to ensure that the development has a satisfactory appearance.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR