



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/21/3274812

11 Honeycroft Hill, Uxbridge UB10 8NQ

- 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 Adam Czasika against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 33016/APP/2021/164, dated 3 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a double storey side extension with rear projection and attic storage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a double storey side extension with rear projection and attic storage at 11 Honeycroft Hill, Uxbridge UX10 8NQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 33016/APP/2021/164, dated 3 January 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 and Block Plan (Rev A); 3215-01 and 3215-01-02 Rev A.
 - 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 the host property and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling fronting the north side of Honeycroft Hill. The appearance of the streetscene along this side of the road is characterised by the pairs of semi-detached dwellings each possessing a front elevation which has a projecting gable roof with bay windows below, hipped main roof and being sited to the rear of a front garden.
4. A number of the other dwellings have been altered, including side extensions of varying widths and designs. Predominantly these other side extensions have

first floor front elevations set back from the host dwellings' main façade, a lower ridge height than the main roof and a flank wall sited away from the side boundary. These design features reflect the guidance contained in Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (LP).

5. The proposed development includes the erection of a 2-storey side extension with a hipped roof. A previous scheme for a side extension, together with a rear roof dormer, was dismissed on appeal (Ref APP/R5510/D/20/3254070) because of concerns associated with its design, scale and bulk. This appeal scheme does not include the previously proposed front and rear roof extensions and its overall scale and bulk would be less than the previous scheme.
6. Although the proposed extension's first floor front elevation would be set back from the property's main façade, have a ridge height lower than the main roof and the flank wall would be sited away from the shared boundary, it would be more than half the width of the host property. LP Policy DMHD 1 identifies that side extensions should be limited in width to less than half the width of the original property to avoid over-dominance of the original house. However, this drafting does not impose an absolute limitation on the width of a side addition and cannot take into account the circumstances of individual proposals.
7. By reason of its size and bulk, the appeal scheme would not be a physically or visually dominant addition to the host property but, together with the setting back of the front elevation and lower ridge height, would appear a subservient addition. Unlike the previous appeal, the design of the proposed development would ensure that the property's existing front elevation would remain the prominent feature in the streetscene, especially the projecting front gable.
8. Within the context of the similarly altered dwellings fronting the road, the resulting property would not appear so conspicuous or prominent in the streetscene so as to cause material harm to its character and appearance. The scale and design of the resulting property would maintain the continuity and rhythm of the semi-detached dwellings fronting this side of the road. The assimilation of the resulting property into the character and appearance of the streetscene would be assisted by the proposed extension using matching external materials and this could be secured by a suitable condition.
9. 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. LP Policy DMHB 12 specifically concerns matters related to works to the public realm rather than extensions to dwellings.
10. In addition to a condition concerning matching materials, a condition is necessary, for the avoidance of doubt, 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