



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2024 by J Reed MPlan

**Decision by Chris Forrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 27 February 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3342689**

**15 Roker Park Avenue, Ickenham, Middlesex UB10 8ED**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mrs R Cheema against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref is 41735/APP/2023/3496.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a first-floor side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Roker Park Avenue is a cul-de-sac of two storey detached dwellings of contemporary design finished in brickwork and setback from the highway. They are consistent in their form and design, with all but one maintaining a clear first floor setback from the principal elevation to accommodate a tall vertical window to the side elevation. Whilst some properties have been altered at ground floor level, with changes to windows and the addition of porches, they maintain a consistent design particularly at first floor level. Their siting, style, form and finish gives the area a local distinctiveness which creates a sense of uniformity and cohesion.
5. Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two: Development Management Policies (2020) (LP) requires extensions to respect the design of the original house and the streetscene, as well as detailed criterion on such alterations and extensions. This includes a minimum set back of 1 metre behind the main front elevation.
6. Whilst the appeal proposal includes this 1 metre set back, the introduction of a first-floor extension in this location would fail to harmonise with the original architectural composition of the host dwelling. The resultant building would be markedly at odds with the prevailing style of houses in the road, which is so

typical of Roker Park Avenue. This is particularly the case as it would result in the substantial loss of the distinctive stepped front elevation which is a key design feature of these contemporary properties. It would also result in the loss of the tall vertical side window which is another key design feature. As a result, the proposal would unacceptably erode the uniformed quality of the area.

7. In coming to that view, I acknowledge that the ridge line of the extension would match the existing and that matching external materials would also be used. I have also had regard to the extension at 8 Roker Park Avenue and examples of other extensions drawn to my attention. However, the extension at No.8 is at odds with all other properties in the streetscene and as such does not justify the proposal before me. Furthermore, the other examples do not exhibit the same street character as that on Roker Park Avenue. Moreover, each proposal must be assessed on its individual merits.
8. As set out above, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene of Roker Park Avenue and would conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the LP which, amongst other matters, seeks for development to be designed to the highest standards, and to harmonise and integrate with its local context.

### **Other Matters**

9. No objections have been received from local residents to the appeal scheme, and it would appear that other residents are keen to utilise the space above their garages in a similar fashion to the appeal proposal. However, neither of these factors provide for a compelling reason why planning permission should be granted for an otherwise unacceptable development.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

10. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

*J Reed*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence, and my representative's report, and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

*Chris Forrett*

INSPECTOR