



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2024

**by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 4 November 2024**

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3351081**

**19 Copthall Road East, Ickenham, Hillingdon UB10 8SD**

- 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 Jay Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref is 68378/APP/2024/997.
- The development proposed is the erection of a part first floor rear extension.

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a part first floor rear extension at 19 Copthall Road East, Ickenham, Hillingdon UB10 8SD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 68378/APP/2024/997, 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: 2024/061-01; 2024/061-02; 2024/061-03; 2024/061-04 and 2024/061-05.
  - 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. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is an altered semi-detached dwelling situated within a primarily residential area. The existing alterations include a hip to gable roof extension, a dormer window erected within the rear roofslope and a single storey side and rear addition. These alterations have already adversely affected the original architectural composition of the property. The proposed development includes modest sized first floor rear extension with a low hipped roof which would project above part of the existing rear addition.

4. The roof of the appeal scheme would overlap in part the rear elevation of the existing dormer and this would be seen from the gardens of neighbouring properties. However, the form and height of the proposed roof would not affect the existing openings within the rear elevation of the dormer. There would not be an awkward juxtaposition between the appeal scheme and the existing openings which would result in an incongruous addition to this already significantly altered property which has lost much of its original architectural composition at the rear. Accordingly, there would not be a conflict with the high quality design objectives of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (HLP1) and Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (HLP2).
5. By reason of the scale of the alterations the appeal scheme would not conflict with HLP1 Policy DMHD 1 concerning extensions respecting the design of the original property. However, if this appeal is allowed, the external materials of the appeal scheme should match those of the property to enable the proposed extension to integrate with the existing dwelling.
6. Further, because of its size and form the proposed hipped roof would not visually dominate the dormer nor this already altered dwelling. As sought by HLP2 Policy DMHD 1 there would be no adverse cumulative impact of the appeal scheme on the character, appearance or quality of the wider area. The proposed extension would not be visible from the road and, as such, it would not conflict with HLP2 Policy DMHB 12 by causing harm to the streetscene's character and appearance.
7. As identified by the council, the proposed extension's hipped roof would contrast with the main roof's gable form. However, when viewed from the rear gardens, the rear roof is dominated by the box shaped dormer rather than there being a clearly discernible gable roof form. By reason of the dormer's form, this is not a case where the roof of a rear extension should be of a similar pitch as the main roof as sought by HLP2 Policy DMHD 1.
8. For the reasons given, the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would not conflict with HLP1 Policy BE1 and HLP2 Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 11. Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan are generic policies about optimising site capacity via a design led approach and the use of a design led approach for larger schemes rather than either policy specifically addressing householder applications.

## **Conditions**

9. The council has suggested several conditions in the event this appeal succeeds which have been assessed against the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. For reasons of clarity, a condition is necessary to secure the erection of the proposed extension in accordance with the approved drawings. To assist with the assimilation of the appeal scheme into the surrounding area a condition for the external materials to match those of the property is necessary. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be allowed.

*D J Barnes*

INSPECTOR