



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2023

by Sian Griffiths BSc(Hons) DipTP MScRealEst MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3329794

35 Newcroft Close, Uxbridge UB8 3RH

- 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 Rajiv Kumar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 23577/APP/2023/1116, dated 15 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 11 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is erection of part single storey and part two storey extension to the rear of the dwelling and erection of first floor side extension with new front facing window at first floor level following demolition of existing conservatory to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of part single storey and part two storey extension to the rear of the dwelling and erection of first floor side extension with new front facing window at first floor level following demolition of existing conservatory to the rear at 35 Newcroft Close, Uxbridge UB8 3RH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23577/APP/2023/1116, dated 15 April 2023 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents: Location Plan, Plans 101 (Plan), 102 (Plan), 107 (Site Plan), 104 (Elevation), 105 (Roof Plan), 106 (Site Plan), and 103 (Elevation).

Preliminary Matters

2. During the determination of the application, the council changed the description of development to add in the proposed new front facing window at first floor level. For accuracy, I have used the description of development on the decision notice.

Reasons

3. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposals on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene.
4. Newcroft Close is a quiet residential cul de sac with a suburban character. The street contains mix of a detached, semi-detached and terraced houses and bungalows, set behind front gardens, with off-street parking. The appeal property (No. 35) is detached and is situated at the head of the cul-de-sac and is flanked by a row of terraced houses and a pair of semi-detached houses.
5. No. 35 has a traditional two storey design with a pitched roof, enclosed porch and garage to the side. The appeal proposals would enlarge the host dwelling to create 2 additional bedrooms on the first floor and a larger kitchen and living space on the ground floor. The additions would have a roof design that sits well below that of the existing ridge line of the host dwelling.
6. Policy DMHB 11 (Design of New Development) of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) (LP2) requires that all new development (including domestic extensions) is designed to harmonise with its local context. Policy DMHB 12 (Streets and Public Realm) of LP2 requires development to be integrated into its surroundings.
7. DMHD 1 (Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings) of LP2 requires that all domestic extensions do not have an adverse cumulative impact of the proposal on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area, nor adjacent dwellings and that the proposals are subordinate to the host dwelling.
8. The rear extension would be largely at a single storey level, with a narrower second storey extension running out to the rear from the side extension. From the principal elevation, I consider the overall effect would be limited as much of the bulk of the development would be focussed to the rear.
9. The council argue that the use of a crown roof (for the side extension) would add bulk and massing, resulting in harm to the character of the area but I do not agree. I consider it would be very difficult to discern significant bulk from the front or the rear of the appeal dwelling as a result of the proposed design. I therefore do not agree that the proposals would be 'top heavy' as is the case made by the council.
10. I note that the concerns the council also raise include the effect of 'terracing' between properties along this part of the street, caused by the closure of a gap between No's 35 and 37. However, as the neighbouring property at No 37 already has a single storey garage to the side, this, in my view would preserve a gap between the dwellings, such that I do not agree the extension would result in unacceptable enclosure within the street scene.
11. I therefore do not consider that this would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or wider streetscene. There would, in my view, be no offence to policies DMHB11, DMHB12 or DMHD1 of the LP2.

Conclusions

12. In addition to the standard commencement condition (1), a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the

approved plans (2) in order to protect the character and appearance of the area. Finally, I have added a condition (3) requiring that development is undertaken in accordance with the approved plans, which are listed for precision and for the avoidance of doubt.

13. For the reasons given, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions set out above.

Sian Griffiths

INSPECTOR