



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2022

by Alison Scott (BA Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3299184

48 Pole Hill Road, Uxbridge, UB10 0QB

- 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 Syed Hussain against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 33924/APP/2021/3202, dated 19 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is Retention of existing front porch and erection of a part two storey/part single storey rear extension following partial demolition of existing single storey rear extension and extension to existing dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the erection of a part two storey/part single storey rear extension following partial demolition of existing single storey rear extension and extension to existing dormers. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the retention of the existing porch extension and planning permission is granted to retain the existing porch at 48 Pole Hill Road, Uxbridge, UB10 0QB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 33924/APP/2021/3202, dated 19 August 2021, and the plans submitted with it so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted subject to the following condition:

1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 001, 010, 011, 012, 020, 021, 023.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the proposal has been amended by the Council. The appellant's appeal form uses the same description. I have therefore also used this wording within the banner heading as it accurately describes the proposal before me.
3. The front porch has already been erected on site. The Council raises no concerns in relation to this extension and I have no reason to contradict their findings. Therefore this part of the proposal is severable from the other.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

5. The appeal bungalow is an 'A' frame style dwelling with side dormers present to both sides of the roof pitches. It is located in a residential area characterised by similar bungalow development. The site is positioned on a prominent corner adjacent to the vehicular access into Harrow View. As a consequence the full eastern and southern side of the bungalow is visually exposed within the street scene.
6. The dwelling has been extensively extended to the roof and to the rear by virtue of a number of additions that creates a piecemeal form of development to the rear.
7. The front porch has been erected on site. It is a subservient extension to the host dwelling with appropriate materials used to its finish. It also appears similar to other front porches that are visible within the street scene and has no adverse effect upon the character and appearance of it. I therefore find this element of the development to be an acceptable addition to the dwelling.
8. Turning to the matter of the rear extensions, the existing extensions would be partly removed and combined and extended to accommodate a new single storey extension together with a two-storey extension and enlarged dormers to part of this roof.
9. As the dwelling has previously been extended, the proposed infill would provide a more cohesive appearance to the dwelling, and I could see that other dwellings have extended to the rear with flat roofs.
10. However, it would be the combination of extensions that would uncharacteristically disrupt the proportions of the host dwelling. The two-storey element with enlarged dormer would considerably extend the scale, bulk and mass of the upper part of the dwelling. Added together with the infill would create a visually elongated dwelling, proportionately out of character with the original dwelling.
11. Located on this prominent corner position, with limited screening properties, and despite matching materials, it would appear oversized and dominate the host dwelling. Despite the use of matching materials and fenestration styles, it would nonetheless appear incongruous and visually intrusive within the street scene.
12. I appreciate the efforts of the appellant to reduce the size of extension from that previously refused by the Council. It would lead to no detrimental effect on the living conditions of local neighbours. Even so, I have considered this proposal on its own merits and share the Council's concerns that it would not safeguard the character and appearance of the street scene.
13. Other extensions brought to my attention by the appellant do not precisely share the same characteristics. These dwellings are set between other bungalows and the effect of extensions to the street scene is significantly reduced. I apply limited weight to these as comparison development. The appeal decision is also of limited comparison. It is located between bungalows and is therefore screened from exposure from within the wider street scene.
14. Therefore, bringing all matters together, to conclude on this main issue, the porch extension is an acceptable addition to the host dwelling and therefore

meets the design expectations of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

15. However, the rear extensions by virtue of scale and mass would not harmonise with the host dwelling and thus not safeguard the character and appearance of the street scene contrary to the design aims of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

Condition

16. As I have found in favour of the porch element only, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings, where applicable, is imposed.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail in respect of the rear extensions and roof level dormer addition but succeed in respect of the porch extension. A split decision is therefore issued.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR

