



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2021

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 September 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3273927

32 Cedars Drive, Uxbridge UB10 0JU

- 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 and Mrs Sappal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 8951/APP/2021/987, dated 12 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey side and double storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey side and double storey rear extension at 32 Cedars Drive, Uxbridge UB10 0JU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 8951/APP/2021/987, dated 12 March 2021, 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: Location Plan; Block Plan, A101 and A102.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached 2-storey dwelling situated within a primarily residential area. There is a mix of dwelling types and sizes, including 4 other dwellings of similar design as the property. It was noted during the site visit that a single storey side and front extension has been erected at 28 Cedars Drive. The appellant has identified that planning permission for alterations to No. 30 has been granted by the Council (Ref 26112/APP/2020/1765) which are of a similar design to the development proposed at the property. By reason of being a similarly designed neighbouring dwellings, significant weight is given to this other planning permission in the determination of this appeal.

4. Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (LP) states that to alterations and extensions to the front of a house must be minor and should not alter the overall appearance of the house nor dominate the character of the streetscene. The proposed front extension with its pitched roof would be modest in size and would be physically and visually subservient to the scale of the property.
5. Further, the size and design of the proposed front extension, including the partial pitched roof above the garage and alterations of the fenestration, would not represent an incongruous nor dominant addition to the property. The resulting property would retain the appearance a 2-storey detached dwelling and, as such, it would not be detrimental to the mixed residential character and appearance of the streetscene, particularly given the identified planning circumstances of Nos. 28 and 30.
6. In respect of 2-storey rear extensions LP Policy DMHD 1 refers to pitched roofs of extensions being of a similar pitch and using matching materials to that of the original roof and being subordinate to it in design. The use of matching external materials for the proposed development could be secured by a suitable condition.
7. The pitch of the proposed rear extension's roof would be similar to the property's roof but it would be a hipped rather than gabled roof form. However, the hipped roof form would reduce the physical and visual appearance of the proposed extension to ensure that it would appear subordinate in scale to the host property. There would be no unacceptable harm caused by the proposed rear extension to the property's contribution to the mixed residential character and appearance of the surrounding area. The resulting property would retain the character of a 2-storey dwelling located on a reasonably sized plot, including when viewed from neighbouring dwellings some of which have significant rear extensions and roof alterations.
8. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene and, as such, it would not conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 and LP Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1. In addition to criteria for extensions, these policies also require alterations to buildings to be of the highest standards, incorporate good design, appear subordinate to the main dwelling and harmonise with local context.
9. In addition to a condition concerning matching materials and the normal time period for implementation, the only other condition which is necessary for the avoidance of doubt is to require the appeal scheme to be erected in accordance with the approved plans. Accordingly, and for the reasons given, it is concluded that the appeal should be allowed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR