



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 August 2023

by H Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/23/3318219

104 Windsor Avenue, Uxbridge, Hillingdon UB10 9BA

- 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 Mrs Daljit Kaur against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 4516/APP/2022/2283, dated 18 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 September 2022.
- The development proposed is erection of a 3 bedroom house including 2 x dropped kerb, cycle and bin storage and EV charging point.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the area, and
 - the living conditions of the future occupiers of the dwelling with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is a corner plot at the junction of Windsor Avenue and Regent Avenue, in a predominantly residential area with dwellings set back from the road and with a strong building line giving a regular rhythm to the street scene. The area is characterised by semi-detached dwellings with a symmetrical appearance, in the vicinity of the proposal. There are also examples of short terraces of three or four dwellings on both Windsor Avenue and Regent Avenue.
4. Regent Road has a regular building line, particularly apparent when looking towards Windsor Avenue. The space at the corner is a feature of the area and contributes positively to the character of the area. Although the proposed dwelling would be separated from those on Regent Avenue by the rear garden and single storey building, when viewed from Regent Avenue, it would be positioned closer to the rear of the footway and would appear as a bulky, cramped and prominent addition to the street.
5. It would have a different roof form than the neighbouring dwellings which have been extended with a flat roof dormer to the rear. The proposed pitched roof whilst being lower than the neighbouring dormers, would not reflect this established pattern of development and would be a bulky and incongruous addition to the street scene when viewed from Regent Road.

6. My attention has been drawn to examples of dwellings occupying corner plots and of terraced properties. I do not have the full details of the schemes before me, however they do not appear to be directly comparable to this scheme. The corner properties are of a different design to the proposal, the terraces have a symmetrical pitched roof form. Although the photographs showing the building line show buildings close to the corners, I have determined this appeal on the site-specific circumstances of this case.
7. I conclude that the proposed dwelling would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan 2021 (LP), Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One- Strategic Policies 2012, Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies 2020 (HLP) which together, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development achieves a high quality of design and harmonises with the local context. It would also conflict with the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Living Conditions

8. The proposal includes a bedroom on the second floor which would be solely lit with rooflights. The rooflights appear to be of sufficient size to provide light to the room and due to their height and position within the roof they would provide sufficient outlook for the occupiers of the proposed dwelling, particularly the second-floor bedroom.
9. I conclude that the proposal would provide satisfactory living conditions of the future occupiers of the dwelling with particular regard to outlook. It would not conflict with Policy D6 of the LP and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 16 of the HLP which together, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development is of high-quality design and meets the occupiers' needs.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

10. The proposed development would create an additional dwelling adding to the Council's housing stock and supporting the Government's objective of boosting the supply of homes. My attention has been drawn to other local housing issues, including the need for three-bedroom houses. There would also be economic benefits from the investment in the construction of the dwelling, subsequent occupation and spending associated with future residents. The delivery of a new dwelling would also contribute to the social dimension of sustainable development. However, the nature of these social and economic benefits would be limited due to the small scale of the proposal. Accordingly, the benefits of the scheme carry limited weight.
11. I have found that the appeal proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. In this case, the harm that would result would outweigh the benefits arising from the proposed development.
12. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, that outweigh this conflict. I therefore conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

H Senior

INSPECTOR