The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 September 2020

by J Hunter BA (Hons) Msc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/20/3253556
394A Long Lane, Hillingdon, Uxbridge UB10 9BG

- 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 Terry and Stephens Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 75000/APP/2020/87, dated 28 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 May 2020.
- The development proposed is described as construction of an enclosure on roof terrace for landscape garden, enclosing access stairway to flat roof with sliding canopy max 1.4m high and formation of a 5m x 6m roof terrace area max 1.35m high.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of an enclosure on roof terrace for landscape garden, enclosing access stairway to flat roof with sliding canopy max 1.4m high and formation of a 5m x 6m roof terrace area max 1.35m high at 394A Long Lane, Hillingdon, Uxbridge UB10 9BG in accordance with the terms of the planning application Ref: Ref 75000/APP/2020/87, dated 28 February 2020 and 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 accordance with the following approved plans:3196-SK1 rev A, 3196-02 rev B.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a two storey terraced building with a shop unit at ground floor. The building is part of a parade of shops alongside a busy thoroughfare. To the rear, there is a service road which provides access to the rear yard and parking areas for each of the units.

4. The appeal proposes the development of a roof terrace in the centre of the flat roof space. The terrace would be set back from the front parapet by around 1.7m and from the rear wall of the building by 3m. The terrace area would be delineated by a 1.3m steel balustrade and an existing internal staircase which

provides access to the roof would be protected from the elements by a clear PVC enclosure of around 1.3m in height.

5. From Long Lane, due to the varied roof forms, building heights, existing parapet and set back, the proposal would be barely visible in the context of the busy street scene. From the rear, it would be possible to see the top portion of the steel balustrade and staircase enclosure. Nonetheless, given the wide range of extensions, additions and finishes I do not consider that the proposal would appear unduly intrusive or incongruous when viewed in the context of the wider area.

6. Overall, given its positioning, limited scale and the use of materials that are already a feature of the area, I consider that the proposal would have a neutral effect on the character and appearance of the area and would therefore not result in harm. Accordingly, the proposal would accord with the design and character and appearance requirements of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan- Part 1 Strategic Policies 2012 (SP) and Polices DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2- Development Management Policies 2020 (DMP) which collectively seek to, amongst other things ensure high quality design that harmonises with the local context.

Conditions

7. In the interests of clarity and certainty I have imposed the standard time limit in which the development should be commenced a condition specifying the approved plans.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above and taking into account all other matters raised I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

J Hunter

INSPECTOR