



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 30 September 2021

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3279876
7 West Common Road, Uxbridge UB8 1NZ

- 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 Ms and Mr L and L Mousley and Herbert against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 1957/APP/2021/1132, dated 22 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is Double & single storey side & rear extension, Revised layout.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, including the appeal property.

Reasons

3. Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan – Part One (LPpt 1) and policies DMHB5, DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part Two (LPpt2), the policies seek, amongst other matters, to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment, to conserve and enhance Hillingdon's distinct and varied environment, ensure that development is reflective of the character of the area and be of good design.
4. The appeal property is referred to as being locally listed. The appellant describes the property as being a "two-storey semi-detached cottage dating from the mid-19th Century and located on the western side of West Common Road. The pair of dwellings were the first to be built along West Common Road, facing on to Uxbridge Common, and formed part of the Victorian expansion of Uxbridge" and based on the evidence before me and my observations on site this description captures the special interest of the property.
5. The submitted plans show the existing extension as being of a narrow width when viewed from the front but the extension projects significantly beyond the rear elevation of the original property, entirely enveloping the rear elevation. The existing flat roofed side and rear extension is acknowledged by the Council as being harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property and based on my observations on site, I agree.
6. The proposed two storey side extension, while reduced from previous proposals, is shown on the submitted plans as being of a notable width in itself

and in proportion to the existing property. The two-storey element would project to the rear of the existing rear elevation of the original property and partially enveloping it. Furthermore, a flat roofed rear extension is shown as being attached to the rear extension.

7. As a result of the significant scale and size of the proposed extension I find that it would subsume the original property and appear as a prominent and incongruous feature in the wider area. The two-storey element of the appeal scheme appears as an incongruous element that relates poorly to the character and appearance of the existing property, in particular I note that the hipped roof shown as shown on the proposed is at odds with the traditional gable end of the existing roof structure.
8. That the scheme would result in the removal of the existing harmful extension is a material consideration that weighs in favour of the appeal scheme. However, based on the evidence before me and my observations on site it is my planning judgement that the appeal scheme would result in a greater degree of harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.
9. To conclude the main issue, for the reasons detailed above I find that the appeal scheme would harm the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area and is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of LPpt 1 and Policies DMHB5, DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1 of LPpt2.

Other Matters

10. The appellant details a number of alterations and changes to a previously proposed scheme that have formed the appeal scheme, while these changes have undoubtedly improved the proposed extensions, I have determined the appeal on its own merits and I have found harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.
11. That the appeal scheme would improve accommodation of otherwise modest dwelling is a material consideration that weighs in favour of the appeal scheme but as a largely private benefit to the appellant, it does not outweigh the harm I have identified previously.
12. Other examples provided by the appellant do not appear comparable to the appeal property or the proposed extension and I am not aware of all of the policies and circumstances that applied at the time that these works were granted planning permission.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mr M Brooker

INSPECTOR