
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 April 2015

by Mrs H M Higenbottam BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20 April 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/15/3004965

72 Windsor Avenue, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB10 9AY

- 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 Manji Brar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref: 27737/APP/2014/3643, dated 3 October 2014, was refused by notice dated 4 December 2014.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing store and addition of a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is on the north side of Windsor Avenue at the junction with Ryefield Avenue. The host dwelling is two storey, semi-detached, red brick with a hipped roof. There is currently a flat roofed single storey structure which is used as a store, abutting the flank wall of the original dwelling. The store is stepped back from the front elevation of the host dwelling, and is less than half the depth of it. The store extends out to the side boundary with Ryefield Avenue and the only opening within it is a door on the rear elevation. It is proposed to demolish this store structure and to erect a single storey extension in its place.
4. The proposed single storey extension would be about 5.95m wide, extending to about 1m from the side boundary with Ryefield Avenue. Its front elevation would be in alignment with the existing front elevation of No 72 and be the same depth as the host dwelling. It would have a hipped roof with tiles to suit the low pitch of the roof. There would be a four pane window to the front elevation and a door and window on the rear elevation.
5. The Council has produced Supplementary Planning Document entitled Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions (HDAS). This requires that side extensions should not dominate the existing character of the original property but appear subordinate; that pitched roofs should not

- exceed 3.4m at the highest point; roof angles should match the existing if visible from the public highway; the extension should not exceed two thirds of the width of the original dwelling; and it should respect the spacing of development on corner plots and not breach the return building line.
6. The existing store breaches the return building line and is wider than the existing dwelling and as such is contrary to the HDAS. However, its step back from the front elevation, limited depth, flat roof form and lack of fenestration on the front and side elevations make it a subordinate structure within the street scene. The front elevation appears as a boundary wall, with additions above the brickwork, which separates the front garden from the rear garden.
 7. The appeal property sits on a large corner plot. The proposed extension would not be as wide as the existing store structure and would introduce a gap of about a metre between the flank elevation and the boundary with Ryefield Avenue. I consider this is an improvement over the existing relationship of the store structure with the boundary. Adequate room exists within the plot to accommodate the proposed extension and it would not appear as either cramped or overdeveloped.
 8. However, the proposed extension would have a greater height and depth and be significantly bulkier than the existing store structure. The roof form would increase the bulk of the structure compared with the existing flat roofed store structure. Furthermore, the proposed roof of the extension would fail to harmonise with the pitch or form of the host property. The low pitch of the proposed roof would appear incongruous within the street scene and it would be contrary to guidance within the HDAS. Due to the large bulk and prominence of the proposed roof this adds significantly to my concerns.
 9. In addition no details of what type of roof tile would be capable of being used on such a low pitched roof or whether the roof tile/material would complement the existing roof materials of the host property. This concern could not be overcome by the imposition of a condition requiring approval of materials as the pitch may not accommodate appropriate tiles. The appellant has also indicated that he would be willing to amend the height of the roof/introduce a crown roof to the structure. No details of a revised scheme are before me. In any event it would represent a material change to the proposed scheme which must be put to the Council in the first instance to ensure that not other interests would be prejudiced. Such changes cannot be accepted as part of this appeal.
 10. The appellant considers the extension would represent an improvement over the existing situation. He has referred to a number of extensions, providing photographs of extended properties, which he considers are similar or raise important issues in the context of the appeal development. However, no addresses are provided and no indication as to if or when the extensions were permitted or built has been supplied.
 11. I saw that the other three corner properties at the junction of Windsor Avenue and Ryefield Avenue, to the northeast (No 70), east (No 107) and south east (No 105) of the appeal site have all been extended to the side. No 107 is a detached dwelling with a single storey side extension. No 105 is a semi-detached dwelling with a two storey side extension. No 70 is a semi-detached dwelling with a large single storey side extension with a crown hipped roof and other single storey additions to the rear. Nonetheless, each of these

extensions appears to fail to comply with the current advice within the HDAS and, in my judgement, also fails to complement or harmonise with the street scene. However, they are an existing part of the character and appearance of the area. The proposed extension would be different in form and design to these extensions which already exist and which themselves are not worthy of repetition.

12. The proposed extension, due to its overall bulk, incongruous roof and prominence within the street scene would harm the existing character and appearance of the immediate area and the host property. This would be contrary to saved Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (adopted 1998) which require development to harmonise with the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the original building and the existing street scene and complement or improve the amenity and character of the area. It would also be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 Strategic Policies (Adopted November 2012) which requires development to achieve a high quality of design which enhances the local distinctiveness of the area, and to contribute to community cohesion and a sense of place.
13. Furthermore, the proposal would conflict with one of the core principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which is to always seek to secure high quality design. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and is indivisible from good planning. The Framework goes on to state that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

Conclusion

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

Hilda Higenbottam

Inspector