



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/23/3323693

38 St George's Drive, Ickenham, Hillingdon, UB10 8HP

- 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 Chadda against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 298/APP/2023/366, dated 8 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 6 April 2023.
- The development proposed is two storey rear, first floor side extension and two dormers.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey rear, first floor side extension and two dormers at 38 St George's Drive, Ickenham, Hillingdon, UB10 8HP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 298/APP/2023/366, dated 8 February 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: Location and Site Plan; 38-22 005; and PA-01.
 - 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 on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling, located in a road comprising of detached and semi-detached houses and bungalows, most of which are of a similar design. At my site visit I observed that a first floor side and a two storey rear extension was under construction at the appeal property.

4. The planning history of the site is relevant to the appeal proposal. In January 2023 planning permission was granted for the erection of a two storey rear and first floor side extension¹, which mirrors the proposed first floor side and rear extension proposal. A Certificate of Lawful Development² (the CLD) was also granted in February 2023 for a loft conversion incorporating side dormer windows which is also very similar to the proposed loft conversion and side dormers. The appeal proposal is therefore essentially an amalgamation of the above schemes.
5. The proposed first floor side extension would be well set back from the front elevation of the dwelling and, together with the proposed rear extension, would not be unduly prominent in the street scene. The proposed extensions are of an appropriate design and would not be materially harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. The proposed extensions are also consistent with those already granted permission under the previous application.
6. The proposed side dormer windows would be closer to the frontage of the site than the other extensions and accordingly, would be more visually prominent in the street scene. Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (January 2020) (LP2) states, amongst other things, that roof extensions should be located on the rear elevation only, be subservient to the scale of the existing roof and should not exceed more than two third the average width of the original roof. They should be located below the ridge tiles of the existing roof and retain a substantial element of the original roof slope above the eaves line.
7. The proposed loft conversion and side dormer windows would not be wholly consistent with Policy DMHD 1, although the dormer windows would be set in from the edge of the roof as well as slightly set up from the eaves and would be wholly contained within the roof plane of the dwelling. I do however, attach significant weight to the planning history of the site detailed above, and the realistic fallback position whereby a very similar development could be constructed in accordance with the CLD.
8. Furthermore, side dormers to the dwellings are commonplace along this part of St George's Drive, including at No 41, opposite the appeal site. Whilst I acknowledge the Council's comments that these may have been constructed under permitted development rights, they do, nonetheless, form part of the established character of the area. Accordingly, I do not consider the appeal proposal to be inconsistent with the prevailing character and appearance of the area in this regard.
9. The Council raise concern regarding the cumulative scale, bulk and massing of the proposed side and rear extension and loft conversion with the associated side dormers. However, I do not share this view particularly as the proposed first floor side extension would be well set back from the frontage of the dwelling and together with the rear extension, would not be unduly prominent in the street scene, even when viewed in conjunction with the proposed loft conversion and side dormers. The proposed extensions would be subservient to the host dwelling and would not combine to have a significantly harmful effect on its character and appearance.

¹ LPA ref. 298/APP/2022/3639

² LPA ref. 298/APP/2022/3725

10. Thus, despite some conflict with Policy DMHD 1 of the LP2, I 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 DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the LP2, 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.

Conditions

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

Conclusion

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

J Davis

INSPECTOR