
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2021

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 October 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3276090

14 Church Road, Uxbridge UB8 3NA

- 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 Z Zeb against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 16258/APP/2021/841, dated 3 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is part single, part two storey rear extension and single storey front/side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the Council's description of the development in reaching my decision as it more fully describes the details of the development than that given on the original planning application form. The appellant's appeal form also makes reference to the updated description.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling with a single storey detached garage to the side located on a corner plot at the junction of Church Road and Bosanquet Close. Church Road is in a mature well-established residential area characterised by a mixture of properties of varied styles and design with gabled and hipped roofs set back from the road within spacious landscaped plots. No. 14 Church Road is a traditional two storey hipped roofed property with distinctive double projecting gabled front bay window and mono-pitched tiled open porch canopy extension at the front of the property.
5. The appeal proposal would entail the construction of a single storey front/side/rear extension would extend across the width of the property up to common shared side boundary and project forward in line with the existing mono-pitched porch canopy extension at the front of the property. The two storey rear infill extension would project from the south west corner of the

main house and would be set-in at first floor level from the rear elevation. It would be stepped down below the ridge of the main house with a gabled roof to match the existing gable projection at the rear of the host property.

6. Policy DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies 2020 (HLPP2) states that extensions and alterations should be subordinate to the main dwelling and there should be no adverse cumulative impact on the character or appearance of the existing streetscene.
7. Policy DMHD1 of the HLPP2 specifies all side extensions should be limited to less than half the width of the original property to avoid over dominance of the original house. In this case, the proposed single storey front/side/rear extension would be more than half the width of the original property. Whilst I note the appellant's comments that this policy is not referred to in the Council's Reasons for Refusal, the appellant's statement nonetheless addresses the points raised in the Council's delegated planning report on this policy. As such, I consider neither main parties would be prejudiced by my consideration of this policy, which is relevant to this case.
8. The appeal property is on a relatively spacious plot and as such the extensions would not appear overlarge, relative to the overall plot size. Given the site's location and mature landscaping and boundary treatment along the side and rear boundaries, the proposed two storey rear extension would only be visible over short distances when passing the site. The rear extensions would be seen in the context of the current varied architectural styles at the rear of the host property and the surrounding properties.
9. Against this backdrop, the scale, form and siting of the proposed two storey rear extension would not look significantly out of place or excessive in relation to the built form of the host property and the adjacent properties. The overall scale and proportions of the rear extensions set back from the site boundaries, together with use of matching materials and fenestrations would ensure that this part of the development would sit relatively unobtrusively against the built form of the host property. The proposed rear extensions would therefore achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property and as such would limit any significant adverse impacts on the street scene in the surrounding area.
10. The scale and form of the proposed single storey front/side extension built in line with the front of the main house would nevertheless still be a significant addition relative to the main property. Although it would replace the existing detached garage at the side of the property, the proposed single storey side extension coupled with the awkward design and unsympathetic appearance of the front extension, would result in additional bulk at the front and side that would be out of character with the more modest traditional form and appearance of the host building.
11. These shortcomings would be exacerbated by the proposal's position, where the proposed extension would be visible from a number of public vantage points along Church Road. The proposed single storey front/side extension, by virtue of its scale, siting and design, would fail to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property and would detract from its architectural integrity. As such, I consider that the proposed single storey

front/side extension would result in an incongruous and out-of-keeping addition that would cause unacceptable harm to the host property and the area.

12. I have considered the appellant's arguments that the design and layout of the proposed extensions has been carefully considered in order to take into account the character of the host property and to minimise any impacts on the area. However, whilst the use of matching materials and fenestrations together with the boundary treatment would assist in integrating the proposal with the host property and the area, these aspects do not overcome the adverse effects outlined above.
13. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed single storey front/side extension would adversely harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would be contrary with the overall design aims of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies 2012 and Policies DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1 of the HLPP2, which I consider are relevant to this case. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development proposals, including residential extensions, will be of a high standard of design that harmonise with the local context and make a positive contribution to the local area in terms of layout, form, scale and materials.

Other Matters

14. I have noted the other developments in the area drawn to my attention by the appellant. However, the extensions and alterations at No. 12 Church Road are of a different scale and form and were approved in a different policy context. The various extensions and residential development along Church Road have different development characteristics to the appeal scheme. In any event, each proposal falls to be assessed primarily on its own merits and I am unaware of the full circumstances associated with these other cases.
15. I note the appellant's comments regarding the various benefits arising from the proposal including the scheme's high quality design and to create additional accommodation to meet the needs of the appellant. While I have given them some weight, these benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified. For all these reasons, there are no other material considerations to outweigh the development plan conflicts identified.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR