



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2023

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3326375

49 Woodstock Drive, Ickenham, Hillingdon, UB10 8EQ

- 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 Dipak Dhamecha against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 20009/APP/2023/1189, dated 23 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is rear single storey extension and external storage area, double storey side extension to both sides, and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for rear single storey extension and external storage area, double storey side extension to both sides, and loft conversion at 49 Woodstock Drive, Ickenham, Hillingdon, UB10 8EQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20009/APP/2023/1189, dated 23 April 2023, 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: 001A, 002A, 100, 101, 200 and 201.
 - 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) The dormer windows hereby approved shall have a hung tile finish to match the colour of the existing roof tiles.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling. It forms one of a group of dwellings along the northern side of Woodstock Drive and nearby Witney Close which are of a similar original design. Many of the surrounding dwellings

- have been extended to the side at two storey level, with several also benefiting from rear extensions.
4. The Council, in their Officer report, raise no objection to the 'right hand' side extension. This extension would be flush with the main front elevation of the dwelling and would be of a similar design and appearance to two storey extensions to nearby dwellings of the same original design.
 5. Whilst the front elevation of the original dwelling is slightly staggered, the 'left hand' side extension would be flush with the part of the front elevation that it would adjoin and would also continue the eaves and ridge height of the host dwelling. The proposed extension would have a modest width of about 1.93m and a distance of at least 1 metre would be retained between the flank wall of the extension and the side boundary of the site. Beyond the side boundary is a private access to Warren House which separates the appeal property from 47 Woodstock Drive. Given the intervening access, I am satisfied a significant gap between Nos 47 and 49 would be retained and the extension would not be materially harmful to the street scene in this regard.
 6. The proposed side extensions are both designed to appear integral to the host dwelling. Whilst in combination the extensions would result in a relatively wide dwelling, there are other dwellings in the immediate area that are of similar width and I do not consider that the proposal would be out of keeping with the street scene in this respect. Furthermore, I consider that the proposed side extensions would respect the design of the original house and would not result in harm to its character and appearance or that of the surrounding area.
 7. The proposal also involves a loft conversion, with three evenly sized dormers proposed on the rear elevation. Whilst the proposed dormers in total would exceed two thirds of the width of the original roof, they would be set down from the ridge of the dwelling, be set up from the eaves and set in from the side of the roof. The dormers would be regularly spaced and, in my view, would sit comfortably on the extended roof slope such that they would appear proportionate and subordinate. I do however agree with the Council that a matching tile hanging finish to the dormers would be more appropriate than the proposed aluminium material. This is a matter that could be adequately controlled by a condition. Subject to this, I find that the proposed dormers would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area where they would not be unduly prominent.
 8. The proposed extension to the porch is also of a similar size to others in the immediate vicinity and the porch would continue to be subservient in appearance to the remainder of the front elevation. Houses in the area display a variety of front porch and canopy additions and in my view, the proposed timber cladding would add visual interest without resulting in any material harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or surrounding area.
 9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. It therefore complies with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (January 2020) and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021). These policies, amongst other matters, seek to ensure developments are of a high

quality design which respects the design of the original property and surrounding area. There would also be no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) insofar as it seeks good quality design.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard 3 year implementation condition, the approved plans condition is imposed for clarity. I have also imposed conditions requiring materials to match those of the existing dwelling to protect visual amenity.

Conclusion

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

J Davis

INSPECTOR