



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 March 2026 by E Clifford BA (Hons) MA

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 May 2026

Appeal Ref: 6005592

4 Almond Avenue, Ickenham UB10 8NA

- 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 Mr/Mrs Sabharwal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 61421/APP/2025/2697.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side and double storey rear extension as granted 61421/APP/2024/2854 and enlargement of loft space to form habitable accommodation.
-

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.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

3. Works appear to have commenced on site but given the appeal dwelling was shrouded at the time of my visit it is unclear as to whether they are complete. I have considered my recommendation accordingly. I have no reason to disagree with the Council's conclusions on other elements of the scheme that are acceptable. My recommendation thus focusses on the roof dormers and, specifically, whether they would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ickenham Village Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. This part of the CA is reflective of local suburban expansion in the early decades of the 20th Century, following the Metropolitan Railway which allowed for easy access to London. The feel of the area is similar to a garden suburb in this respect, with more sparsely spread development and generous gardens which give ranging views of buildings individually and collectively. The appeal building is a good and largely original example. It is detached and set back from the road behind a low boundary wall. It has an unbroken hipped roof and double height projecting bay window at the front. Its detailing is simple and unfussy.
5. The street scene hosts a mix of detached and semi-detached examples. Some in the Arts and Crafts style with forward and side facing dormer windows. They tend to be an established, deliberate, and importantly recessive feature of a building's roof architecturally. Some other examples are on more modern buildings. The

blend of styles presents a cohesive and complementary planned group with the aforementioned features being consistent and, together, they contribute positively to the significance of the CA.

6. The proposal would see the side dormers set below the existing roofline and up from the eaves of the appeal dwelling, albeit only by a small amount. They would thus project almost the full depth of the roof, creating a significant increase in bulk at the upper level of the building. When viewed from the street, the resultant appearance would be that of a top-heavy and bulky roofline, out of keeping with the established, simple, and original lines of the street scene's roofscape.
7. The planning permission granted recently for Milton Court relates to a similar scheme as is considered under this appeal; in particular, my attention has been drawn to the approved side dormer window. However, the provided plans show that the dormer window is of a reduced scale when compared to that proposed at the appeal site. It is positioned lower on the roof, allowing a greater level of subserviency and does not project outwards to the extent that the appeal scheme would. My findings do not therefore change. Neither would they in light of the outcome of appeal APP/R5510/D/3270366, which did not include the proposed dormers subject of this appeal.
8. The appeal scheme would thus fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Given the scale of and nature of the proposal, the harm would be at the lower end of less than substantial. Nonetheless, great weight should be given to the conservation of the CA. The harm should be weighed against any public benefits deriving from the proposal. None have been put forward. Any arising from the additional accommodation for the occupiers would be a private benefit. I find therefore that there are no public benefits sufficient to outweigh the harm I have found.
9. Consequently, the proposals would conflict with Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021). This requires development to respond to the valued features and characteristics that are unique to the locality. It would also be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One- Strategic Policies (2012) which requires all new development to make a positive contribution to the local area in terms of scale and form.
10. Furthermore, it would not align with Policies DMHB4, DMHB11, DMHB12 or DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020). These explain, amongst other things, that development will be expected to conserve or enhance the character or appearance of a conservation area, harmonise with the local context, be well integrated into the surrounding area and dormer windows should, generally, be on the rear elevation away from ridges or eaves.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Clifford

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR