
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 February 2015

by JP Roberts BSc(Hons), LLB(Hons), MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10 March 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/14/2229887

22 Warren Road, Ickenham, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB10 8AD

- 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 and Mrs Julian Ingram against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 26405/APP/2014/3588, dated 7 October 2014, was refused by notice dated 1 December 2014.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first floor rear extension and part conversion of an existing attached garage to habitable use.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a first floor rear extension and part conversion of an existing attached garage to habitable use at 22 Warren Road, Ickenham, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB10 8AD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 26405/APP/2014/3588, dated 7 October 2014, 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: Refs: 106 Rev P1, 107 Rev P2 and 108 Rev P2.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding mainly residential area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached house in a road characterised by detached houses of individual design. There is considerable variation in both the size and appearance of houses in the road, and other than a general consistency in the extent of set-back from the road and the two-storey detached nature of the houses, there is no distinctive identity to them. The site does not lie in a conservation area, and there is no other local designation in respect of character or appearance.

4. The appeal site is occupied by one of the smaller houses in the road, and it abuts a fenced-off grassed access which leads to school playing fields at the rear of the site. The Council argues that the depth of the two-storey extension would be an intrusive element in the street scene. The house has a catslide roof and so the extension would project over 5m from the highest part of the existing rear roof slope, but about 3m from the original rear elevation of the house, as far as the existing ground floor extension. Thus, the footprint of the dwelling would be unaltered.
5. The front elevation would remain unchanged, and whilst the proposed extension would be off-set from the side elevation by 0.8m or so, much of the side elevation and roof on the western elevation of the extension would be visible when seen from the footway adjacent the access to the school.
6. The Council alleges a conflict with advice in its Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement, adopted in 2008. It says that the proposal conflicts with the guidance that states that a maximum depth of 4.0 metres is permitted for first floor rear extensions whilst the ridge height of the new roof should be at least 0.5m lower than the original and match its pitched roof form. However, the depth of the extension would be less than 3m in depth when measured from the rear wall of the original dwelling and is 0.5m lower than the main roof, and thus this part of the guidance would be complied with.
7. The appeal property is unusual in the road in that there is a gap between it and its neighbour to the west formed by the access strip. This affords more extensive views of the side elevation of No 22 than is possible for most of the houses in the street. Even so, it is clear from what views are possible, that many of the houses are considerably deeper at first floor level than would be the extended dwelling in this case. The design, which incorporates a hipped roof, is both set back from the side elevation and set down from the ridge, and so the extension would not appear as unduly bulky or out of keeping with the street scene. In any event, it would only be seen in a narrow gap, and partly screened by a tree growing in the access strip and the hedge on the boundary of 20 Warren Avenue.
8. Whilst the extension would be seen, I consider that it would still appear as a subservient addition, and would not be harmful to the appearance of the host property, or the street scene.
9. The proposal would have a small flat valley between the two gabled roofs of the extension. I recognise that such a feature is uncommon in the area, and in elevational view on a plan appears as a somewhat unresolved design feature. However, the valley would not appear as an obvious feature when seen from ground level, the only likely viewpoints, and in my view, it is not something which would significantly mar the design quality of the development.
10. I therefore consider that the proposal would be of high design quality and would appear suitably subservient, respect its context and would comply with the objectives of the HDAS. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the proposal would not materially harm the character and appearance of the host building or the surrounding area, and would not conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies, which deals with the built environment. Nor would it conflict with saved Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies

(November 2012), which respectively deal with the street scene, extensions and the character of residential areas.

Conditions

11. The Council has suggested a number of conditions which I have considered in the light of national guidance. A condition to require the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is needed in the interests of good planning and for the avoidance of doubt. A condition to require the use of matching materials is needed in the interests of appearance.

Conclusion

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

JP Roberts

INSPECTOR