



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2020

by William Cooper BA (Hons) MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/20/3246166

Wadhurst & Woodleigh, Chiltern View Road, Uxbridge UB8 2PF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mandozai and Yussouf, Active Development Services Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref: 71690/APP/2019/2986, dated 20 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is part 2 storey rear extension and installation of crossover.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for part 2 storey rear extension and installation of crossover at Wadhurst & Woodleigh, Chiltern View Road, Uxbridge UB8 2PF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 71690/APP/2019/2986, dated 20 September 2019, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved drawings: Site Plan With Proposal 1/8; Existing Ground Floor Plan, Existing First Floor Plan 2/8; Existing Roof Plan 3/8; Proposed Plans 4/8; Existing Elevations 5/8; Existing Elevations 6/8; Proposed Elevations 7/8; Proposed Elevations 8/8.
 - 3) No development shall commence until there shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority details and/or samples of all materials, colours and finishes to be used on all external surfaces. The relevant works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved sample an/or details.
 - 4) No development shall commence until there shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a landscape scheme. Thereafter the development shall be carried out and maintained in full accordance with the approved details. The scheme shall include:
 1. Details of Soft Landscaping: 1.a Planting plans (at not less than a scale of 1:100); 1.b Written specification of planting and cultivation works to be undertaken; 1.c Schedule of plants giving species, plant sizes, and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate;

2. Details of Hard Landscaping: 2.a Refuse Storage (including elevations if appropriate); 2.b Cycle Storage (including elevations if appropriate); 2.c Means of enclosure/boundary treatments (including elevations if appropriate); 2.d Car Parking Layouts (including demonstration that 5% of all parking spaces are served by electrical charging points); 2.e Hard Surfacing Materials; 2.f External Lighting; 2.g Other structures (such as play equipment and furniture);
3. Schedule for Implementation.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the Council's decision, the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Saved UDP Policies (2012) and the London Borough of Hillingdon Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document have been withdrawn. Accordingly, for the purposes of this appeal, the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 Strategic Policies (2012) (LP1), the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) (DMP), and the London Plan (2016)¹ (LP) constitute the development plan. Interested parties have had opportunity to comment on the proposal in the light of these policies. I determine the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of The Greenway Conservation Area (CA), and
 - the effect of the proposed development on highway safety, with particular regard to parking.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The CA comprises a grid of mainly residential streets which is bounded to the west by Cowley Road and to the east by Whitehall Road. From what I saw during my site visit and the evidence before me, the CA's significance lies in the historic townscape which reflects the area's evolution as a residential suburb, with a core Victorian and Edwardian character.
5. The appeal building is located in a row of dwellings on the north side of Chiltern View Road, in the north-east corner of the CA. It is one of two neighbouring pairs of 1930s two-storey, semi-detached dwellings on a mainly residential street.
6. Heading east from the junction with Whitehall Road, the host row on the north side of Chiltern View Road comprises the following two-storey dwellings: a rendered former pub building that has been converted into dwellings; a more recently constructed pair of buff brick and red brick-banded semi-detached dwellings, with substantial rear outriggers; and two pairs of early twentieth century semis, which include the appeal building.

¹ The London Plan: The Spatial Development Strategy for London, Consolidated with Alterations since 2011, March 2016.

7. The front elevations of the building's two dwellings have traditional symmetrical details in the form of ground floor bay windows and open-fronted, recessed arched porches. The hipped red tile roofs and relatively wide bay windows of the host pairs of 1930s semis contrast with the slate gable roofs and lack of, or smaller, bay windows of dwellings located on each side and opposite. Woodleigh has cream painted brick walls, Wadhurst has unpainted red brick walls, while the neighbouring pair of semis to the west has pebble-dashed walls, one half of which is painted and the other is not. As such, the host row has greater architectural variety than the more uniform Victorian buff brick semis on the opposite side of the street and to the west.
8. Within this context, the appeal building contributes positively to the significance of the CA through its early twentieth century domestic character within the streetscene, while also contributing to the more eclectic range of character in the far north-eastern corner of the CA. This eclecticism of character distinguishes the host row from clusters of more similar architectural materiality, form and period which are noticeable elsewhere on Chiltern View Road.
9. The proposed increase in the full-width two-storey depth of the building by almost half would add bulk to the rear. The extension would also include a shallow, single-storey element to the rear of Woodleigh. The addition of render would conceal the brick finish of the building.
10. Nevertheless, the following combination of factors would help the proposed extension to assimilate with the existing building, the site and the area. The varied and eclectic character of the host stretch on the north side of the street, which includes rendered buildings of painted and unpainted finish, would be able to accommodate the proposed changes. The tiled hip roof forms of the main two-storey part of the extension would be around 0.8m lower than the main roof. The hip roof forms would echo the hipped form of the host building's main roof and the outriggers of the neighbouring pair of dwellings at Nos 49A and B Chiltern View Road.
11. In footprint terms, the proposed extension would not exceed the rear building line of the neighbouring pair of dwellings at Nos 49A and B and would provide a stepped transition from the latter to shallower pairs of dwellings to the west. The traditional front porch and bay window details would be retained and the rendering of both properties would reduce distraction from the symmetrical nature of the front elevations, compared to the currently differing external finishes.
12. Moreover, the proposed extension would be visually contained from views from the street within the CA by its location to the rear of the building, facing towards the northern boundary of the CA, and by intervening buildings, boundaries and vegetation in the area. The appeal dwellings would continue to have relatively spacious, L-shaped rear gardens. The use of the appeal building's front gardens for car parking would not be out of keeping with the host row of properties in the far north-eastern corner of the CA. There is scope for planting, such as compact evergreen side boundary hedging in containers or raised beds for example, to visually soften the parking space in front of the building, in the landscape scheme which is to be secured by planning condition.
13. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets and that any

harm to an asset should require clear and convincing justification. Together, the factors identified above would ensure that the proposal would preserve the significance of the CA, resulting in no harm to its character or appearance.

14. As such, the proposed development would accord with Policies BE1 and HE1 of the LP1, Policies DMHB1, DMHB4 and DMHB11 of the DMP and Policy 7.8 of the LP. The policies, when taken together, seek to ensure that development is of appropriate design and appearance to conserve or enhance the historic environment. The policies are broadly consistent with the approach of the Framework in respect of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, with great weight given to the asset's conservation.

Highway safety

15. Chiltern View Road is a two-way residential side street with pavements and street lighting. From what I saw during my site visit, albeit a snapshot in time, on-street parking restrictions help to protect highway visibility and flow and the street is not apparently heavily trafficked.
16. The proposal would entail use of the two dwelling's paved front garden areas for car parking. Allowing for the projection of bay windows, each of the spaces would provide an area of around 4m by 5m for parking. These dimensions fall within the range of the 2.4m x 4.8m specified in Appendix C: Table 1 of the DMP. Nevertheless, the Council is concerned that, measured perpendicular to the highway, the spaces' depth of less than the 4.8m length standard in the Manual for Streets 1 & 2 would result in scope for vehicles overhanging the pavement.
17. However, judging by parking in the vicinity, it would be possible to accommodate a small to medium size car in each of these spaces, parked perpendicular or diagonal to the highway without encroaching onto the pavement. Moreover, alternatively, given the size of the spaces a larger car could be parked in each space, parallel to the highway.
18. While noting the site's 'poor' PTAL 2 rating for access to public transport, I saw during my site visit that the public transport network is realistically accessible from sheltered bus stops located a modest walk away on The Greenway and Hillingdon Road. Therefore, there is some realistic alternative to car use for future occupiers, which would reduce pressure for excessive parking on the spaces at the front of the appeal building.
19. The above factors together lead me to conclude that there is a realistically useable range of parking scenarios which make it likely that cars would manoeuvre onto and off the front garden areas to park without harming pedestrian or highway safety. As such, the proposal would not conflict with Policy DMT6 of the DMP, which seeks to ensure that development safeguards highway amenity.

Other Matters

20. I note resident concern that the proposal would overshadow and be overbearing to the garden of the neighbouring dwelling at No 48b Chiltern View Road. Nevertheless, given the location of the appeal property to the east of the neighbouring property, the proposal's hipped roof profile, the spaciousness of the appeal building's rear gardens and the suburban context, the proposal

would not significantly reduce receivable light to, or impair outlook from, the neighbouring garden.

Conditions

21. The conditions suggested by the Council have been considered against the tests of the Framework and advice provided by Planning Practice Guidance. They have been broadly found to be reasonable and necessary in the circumstances of this case. I have made some minor drafting changes to suggested conditions in the interests of precision. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in order to provide certainty. Conditions regarding materials and a landscape scheme are required to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

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

William Cooper

INSPECTOR