
Appeal Decision

By Richard Thomas BA DipArch RIBA IHBC

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

Site visit made on 28 January 2014

Decision date: 10 February 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/13/2210412

34 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 Michael Tierney against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 33026/APP/2013/2758 was refused by notice dated 18 November 2013.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single / two storey rear extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer and 6 roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the following approved plans, insofar as they are relevant: 10622/101 Rev.P2, 10622/102 Rev.P1, 10622/103 Rev.P1, 10622/104 Rev.P1 (Existing Elevations), 10622/104 Rev.P1 (Existing Roof Plan), 10622/121 Rev.P1, 10622/122 Rev.P1, 10622/123 Rev.P1 and 10622/126 Rev.P1.

Procedural Matter

2. The development was described on the application form as 'Erection of first floor rear extension and loft conversion with rear dormer'. However, I consider that the description used on the Council's decision notice and the appeal form more accurately reflect the full extent of the works proposed. I have therefore utilised that description, as outlined above.

Main Issue

3. The Council acknowledge that the single storey element of the proposed extension could be constructed under permitted development rights and raises no objection to the proposed roof lights and other minor alterations. I see no reason to disagree with that position and as such, my decision will focus on the proposed two storey extension and rear dormer window.

4. Therefore, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed two storey rear extension and rear dormer window on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a traditional, two storey detached house set within a spacious plot. It is finished in red brick with simple fenestration, an integral garage door and a distinctive arched window in its front elevation. Until recently it had a tiled, hipped roof which had been removed at the time of the site visit. Despite this, No.34 retains a pleasing, simple appearance when viewed from the street.
6. Warren Road contains a number of house types, but is largely characterised by detached dwellings set within sizeable plots. The houses vary in size and there are a number of architectural styles and roof forms which, combined with a varied palette of finishing materials, give the street a distinctive, eclectic character.
7. The proposed two storey rear extension would project to a depth of some 4m, and be set in from the sides of the original dwelling by some 0.5m. The proposal would also add a 'crown' roof that would sit below the ridge of the main roof by some 0.5m, with a dormer window set into its rear slope.
8. The proposed extension would not fall within the strict dimensional criteria set out for extensions of this type in the Council's Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions SPD (2008) (the SPD). Notwithstanding this, it would be finished in materials to match the existing house, be set in from its side elevations and set below the main roof. Subject to a condition requiring the use of such materials, I am satisfied that the proposed extension, given the overall scale of the plot and the size of existing house, would achieve an acceptable degree of subservience and would not dominate the host building. Consequently, it would preserve No.34's simple appearance and ensure that it would not appear unduly prominent when viewed within the mix of building sizes found in the street.
9. Whilst the proposed 'crown' and dormer roof forms would not match that of the main building, the positioning of neighbouring properties is such that those elements would only be visible from a small number of locations along Warren Road. In any event, the asymmetrical shape of the proposed roof forms would not be inappropriate when viewed within the variety of roof forms displayed elsewhere in the locality. I am therefore content that the proposal would preserve the locally distinctive character of the area.

Other Matter

10. I have noted the representation submitted by the Ickenham Residents Association. However, it appears to be a more general concern about the extent of permitted development rights and is therefore beyond the scope of this appeal. As such, it does not affect my conclusions on the main issues.

Conclusion

11. The proposal satisfies the objectives of policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (2012) and the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions SPD (2008) which, among other things, seek to ensure that extensions harmonise with existing buildings and preserve local character. For these reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Richard Thomas

INSPECTOR