



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2023

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3311991

92 Berkeley Road, Hillingdon, Uxbridge UB10 9DY

- 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 Meena Bhatti against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 60575/APP/2022/2562, dated 15 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single-storey side extension at 92 Berkeley Road, Hillingdon, Uxbridge UB10 9DY in accordance with the terms of the application, 60575/APP/2022/2562, dated 15 August 2022 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the 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 approved plans: 92 / P / 2022 – 01, 92 / P / 2022 – 02, 92 / P / 2022 – 03, 92 / P / 2022 – 04 and 92 / P / 2022 – 05.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. No.92 is a semi-detached property located on a triangular plot at the end of Berkeley Road at the junction with Lyndhurst Crescent. The surrounding area is residential with mainly semi-detached and terraced properties of a similar style.
4. The appeal property has an existing single-storey extension which wraps around the side and rear. Also to the side is a wooden canopy structure with a transparent roof, which the Council confirm has been present for some time.
5. The proposed extension would replace the canopy, it would be approximately half its depth and positioned centrally. The shallow-pitched roof would integrate

with the existing extension aligning with the eaves, and unlike the existing canopy, the form and materials would match the host property. As such, I find that it would be a sympathetic addition and whilst there would be a cumulative increase in the width of the property, the proposed extension would not be a dominant feature and space would be retained to the side boundary.

6. Due to its siting, the property has a notable presence in the street scene, and the other half of the semi-detached pair does not have additions to the side. Nonetheless, many of the properties along the road have been altered in a variety of ways and there is no consistency in if, or how semi-detached properties have been extended.
7. Given its modest scale, setback, and the existing boundary treatment, which comprises a high wall, the extension will not be visually prominent, and I do not find that the development would appear disproportionate or incongruous to the existing property or the wider character of the area.
8. Overall, I conclude that despite a technical breach of one criterion of policy DMHD1 in relation to the width of side extensions, the site-specific circumstances of this appeal mean that the scheme would still comply with the overall design aims of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020). Together and amongst other things, these seek to ensure that developments are of a high-quality design, harmonise with the local context and that extensions appear subservient to the main dwelling.

Conclusion and Conditions

9. I have imposed conditions relating to the standard time limit for the commencement of development and the plans to be adhered to for certainty. I have also added a condition concerning materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance.
10. For the reasons set I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR

