
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 September 2021

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3274205

15 Frays Waye, Uxbridge, UB8 2RJ

- 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 & Mrs Raeburn against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 76177/APP/2021/373, dated 28 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single-storey rear and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single-storey rear and side extension at 15 Frays Waye, Uxbridge, UB8 2RJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 76177/APP/2021/373, dated 28 January 2021, subject to the following 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 following approved plans: Drg Nos A529-SK1, A529-P-01 and A529-P-02.
 - 3) 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, end terrace dwelling located within a residential area comprising broadly similar type properties. It occupies a corner location at a point where Frays Waye turns through 90 degrees. The proposal is for a single-storey extension that would wrap around the side and rear of the property and that would fill virtually the entire space to the side of the existing

dwelling, extending up to the boundary along the back edge of the pavement at a single pinch-point to the rear corner.

4. The Council has no objection to the size or depth of the rear extension. I have no reason to disagree.
5. Although the dwelling's corner location renders the building prominent within views along Frays Waye from the east and west, during my visit I was unable to identify any importance to the existing space between the side gable of No 15 and the back edge of the pavement which runs along the site's return side boundary. Any sense of openness to the area is derived from the adjacent Rockingham Recreation Ground to the east rather than from the roads that surround this large area of open space. The streets' layouts reflect a fairly dense pattern of development with houses creating largely continuous frontages. Examples given by the appellants demonstrate that there is no uniform amount of space to the side of any nearby corner properties. Neither do the streets follow any regimented or consistent building lines which define the area's character in any meaningful way and which should obviously be protected. For this reason, I cannot agree with the Council's assertion that the loss of the existing space to the side of No 15 would somehow result in a cramped form of development. It would merely add to the existing mix in the area.
6. The side addition would project above the height of the existing approximate 2m high fence which runs along the site's side boundary, but at single-storey it would appear appropriately subservient to the scale of the existing building and not at all bulky. The Council's officer's report suggests that it would be dominant and overbearing when seen from the front of properties on the other side of Frays Waye, but I share the appellants' view that this is an exaggerated impression of what would otherwise be seen in the outlook from these houses as a reasonably modest and unobtrusive addition.
7. My impression overall is that the extension would relate well to the existing dwelling and would sit comfortably in the street scene without impacting in any harmful way upon the character or appearance of the area. As such, I am satisfied that it would display the quality of design that is required by both Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 and Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (LP Part 2). LP Part 2 Policy DMHD 1 deals specifically with alterations and extensions to residential dwellings. For the reasons given, there would be no conflict with the criteria listed within part A of Policy DMHD 1. Part C deals with side extensions. The side addition would not exceed half the width of the original property and I am satisfied that the openness of the area would be maintained with no clearly defined building line beyond the individual circumstances of the appeal property exceeded. No other criteria within this part of the policy are relevant. There would be no conflict with LP Part 2 Policy DMHB 12 which is specifically concerned with matters related to works to the public realm.

Conditions

8. A condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area, and to

comply with LP Policy DMHD1 part A iv), a condition is required to ensure that the extension is finished with materials that would match the existing house.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, I conclude that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of the area. Accordingly, and in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR