



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 March 2019

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 April 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/18/3214064

Beaufort, Tile Kiln Lane, Harefield, Uxbridge UB9 6LU

- 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 & Mrs Jariwala against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 19064/APP/2018/2036, dated 1 June 2018, was refused by notice dated 1 August 2018 .
 - The development proposed is a first-floor rear extension, along with the omission of a single storey parapet wall, being replaced with a pitched roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a first-floor rear extension and alterations to single storey rear roof from flat to pitched at Beaufort, Tile Kiln Lane, Harefield, Uxbridge UB9 6LU in accordance with the application Ref 19064/APP/2018/2036 dated 1 June 2018, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

1020/P/1 Existing Floor Plans, Elevations, Site Plan & Location Plan

1020/P/2 Proposed Floor Plans, Elevations, Site Plan & Location Plan
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development was modified by the Council on their Decision Notice and used by the appellant on the appeal form. I have used that description in my decision above, for the purposes of accuracy. It was the basis on which the Council made their decision, as have I.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Metropolitan Green Belt for the purposes of development plan policy and the

National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework); and

- The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area

Reasons

Inappropriate development

4. The existing property is an extended large two storey dwelling, set in a large plot, in an area of residential development of various house types, with generally similar plot sizes. There is mature vegetation screening to the boundaries with the adjacent properties.
5. The Framework states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 145 states that new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt. However, there are a number of exceptions listed and these include the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in 'disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building'.
6. Policy 7.16B of the London Plan (2016) and Policies OL1 and OL4 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Part Two – Saved Policies (the UDP) reflect national Green Belt policy as far as they reinforce its strong protection. However, there is no policy guidance that is before me on what would constitute a disproportionate addition via an extension or alteration of a building.
7. From the evidence provided, a previous application was approved in 1999 for a two-storey side extension and single storey extensions to the front and rear, which were implemented.
8. It is therefore necessary to take into consideration the overall alterations to the original dwelling. The 1999 approval was significantly bigger than the extensions subject to the current appeal, and cumulatively would create a sizeable extension would be created when seen in the context of the original dwelling.
9. At first floor level, the appeal proposals would not project any further to the rear of the existing dwelling. The hipped roof at first floor level would remain below the overall ridge height of the dwelling, whilst the proposed extension would not increase the overall footprint of the dwelling. In comparison to the overall size of the original dwelling, I find that the size, bulk and scale of the existing and proposed extensions would represent an acceptable increase, compared to the original dwelling.
10. I therefore consider the size of the proposed extension with the other extensions previously constructed would not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. In coming to this view, I have had regard to the measurements in respect of the size of the combined alterations that are set out in the Council submissions.
11. I conclude the proposal would not constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt and thus it would comply with the Framework, Policy 7.16 of the London Plan and 'Saved' Policies OL1 and OL4 of the UDP. The Council has included Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the UDP in this first reason for refusal

as it relates to Green Belt. However, these policies do not refer to the Green Belt, and as such, I attach limited weight to them with regard to this reason for refusal.

12. As I have not found the proposals to be inappropriate development, then the proposals are not regarded as harmful to the openness of the Green Belt, as set out in *Lee Valley Regional Park Authority, R (on the application of) v Epping Forest District Council & Anor (Rev 1) [2016] EWCA Civ 404*. I will therefore not consider the matter any further.

Character and appearance

13. The dimensions of the appeal proposal are consistent with the size of the existing dwelling, and the removal of the flat roof element of the existing single storey extension will assist in creating a more coherently designed dwelling overall. The appeal proposal would not unduly project out and not beyond the existing footprint of the dwelling, as well as appearing subordinate, and nor are characteristic design features found in nearby dwellings that would influence the nature of the design. Overall, the extension would not have a prominent siting when seen in the context of the existing dwelling, it cannot be seen within the street scene, and the design would not cause significant harm to the overall appearance of the dwelling.
14. With the vegetation screening to the adjacent boundaries, and the subsequent distance of the appeal property from those boundaries, there would be some mitigation from the existing vegetation to the adjacent properties and those properties would not be affected by the appeal proposals. The appeal extensions would appear respectful of both the character of the existing dwelling and semi-rural character of the locality. It would not result in the loss of trees and vegetation, and not therefore detract from their contribution to the overall character and appearance of the area.
15. I conclude that the appeal proposal would comply with Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the UDP, policy BE1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 – Strategic Policies (2012) and the guidance set out in the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document (2008) which collectively, state that development should not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and promote a high standard of design.

Conditions

16. I have imposed the standard commencement condition, and a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in the interests of certainty. I have also included a materials condition in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR