



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2021

by Ian McHugh Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 November 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3276636
23 Villier Street, Uxbridge, UB8 2PU

- 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 J Dhadwal against the decision of The London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 19168/APP/2021/464, dated 4 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is a part first-floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the appeal was lodged, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021. In my opinion, this does not materially change the planning policy context in respect of the main issues.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed extension would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of The Greenway, Uxbridge Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an end of terrace dwelling, which is situated in a prominent position on the corner of Villier Street and Elthorne Road. The dwelling is within the CA, which was designated in 1975. One of the main characteristics of the CA is the rows of terraced dwellings that are generally constructed of London Stock bricks with slate roofs.
5. Although many of the properties have been altered over the years, there remains a cohesive appearance to the streetscene. I note that the appeal property was formerly a shop with living accommodation and that the front elevation shows evidence of being changed following the closure of the business. As such, it appears different when compared to the other terraced properties.
6. However, at the rear, which is visible from Elthorne Road, the shallow pitched projecting gable is a distinctive feature, which is common on the rear

elevations of other dwellings along the terrace. These make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.

7. The proposal is to enlarge the property at the rear by constructing a first-floor extension with a mono pitched roof. It would slope up from the existing shallow-pitched gable and would result in a relatively tall brick side wall facing Elthorne Road.
8. Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 seek to achieve high-quality design and to conserve and enhance the Borough's environment. In addition, Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies (LP2) requires new development, including extensions to be of high-quality design. These policies are consistent with Paragraph 130 of the Framework, which requires developments to add to the overall quality of the area, be visually attractive, and to be sympathetic to local character and history.
9. With regard to heritage assets, Policies DMHB 1 and DMHB 4 of LP2 seek to ensure that proposals sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets and make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. These policies accord with Policy HC1 of the London Plan and with the provisions of Chapter 16 of the Framework.
10. The proposed extension would not relate positively to the existing building, because of its mono-pitched roof design and the height and mass of the side wall. It would appear as a discordant and incongruous addition that would be clearly visible in the streetscene, when viewed from Elthorne Road, and it would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with the provisions of the Development Plan and the Framework, as referred to above.
11. In reaching my decision, I have taken into account the appellant's comments in respect of the development at number 21 Elthorne Road (the former Militia Canteen PH). That development for a change of use and various extensions has been completed. However, that building was/is of a different scale and appearance to the appeal property and I do not agree that it should act as a precedent for this appeal.
12. The harm that I have identified would be less than substantial in the context of paragraphs 201 and 202 of the Framework. Consequently, I have considered whether any public benefits may arise from the proposal that would outweigh the harm that I have identified. Whilst, I accept that the proposal would provide additional accommodation for the appellant and his family, this does not, in my opinion, amount to a public benefit, as required by paragraph 202 of the Framework.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR