



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2014

by A Banks BA (Hons) DipUD PGCM MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 September 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/14/2220009

61 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 O McClenaghan against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 13746/APP/2014/845, dated 11 March 2014, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2014.
- The development proposed is part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension, single storey front extension and porch to front involving demolition of existing side element.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension, single storey front extension and porch to front involving demolition of existing side element at 61 Warren Road, Ickenham, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB10 8AD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 13746/APP/2014/845, dated 11 March 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: 1213-03 A; 1213-02 A.
 - 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.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows/dormer windows other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed on the side elevations.

Main issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in a residential street that comprises in the main large individual two-storey detached houses set in spacious grounds. The

appeal dwelling is an unexceptional 1950s style dwelling which appears to be substantially smaller than most houses in the street.

4. The Council raises no contentions with the proposal in respect of its effect to the front elevation. I consider that the changes to the frontage maintain a traditional and well balanced appearance that would augment the character and appearance of the property.
5. The extensions would result in a much deeper building to both sides. However on both sides an acceptable gap would be retained between building and boundaries. This would reflect the spacing that exists in the street and would acceptably avoid any sense of terracing. It would also comply with the requirements of the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document - Residential Extensions 2008. Visibility of the side elevations, as with the crown roof, would be very limited so that these aspects and the additional depth created would have little impact on the character and appearance of the building and less on the overall street scene.
6. The two-storey rear extension would meet the 45-degree line of sight criteria and does not go beyond 4m, in compliance with the HDAS. Its depth would be similar to that of its neighbour at No 63. As a large garden area is retained, this part of the proposal would not noticeably alter building to plot ratio either. The single storey element would extend a little further than the two storey element, but it would have no detrimental impact on the living conditions of neighbouring properties. Moreover I consider it would enhance the horizontal pattern of this elevation. So whilst this small aspect would not comply in the strictest sense with the guidelines provided in the HDAS, it would not undermine its purpose or aims.
7. For these reasons I consider that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the architectural quality of the existing building, nor would it look out of place in the street scene. Thus I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host building and the area. Consequently it would not be contrary to the design intent of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies 2012 and Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies 2012, nor would it subvert the aims of the HDAS.
8. In the interests of proper planning it is necessary to impose a condition to require the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. In the interests of character and appearance it is necessary that materials match those of the host building. To protect the privacy of the occupiers of neighbouring properties it is necessary to impose a condition preventing further windows or openings in the side elevations at first floor level.
9. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Banks

INSPECTOR