

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2022

by A Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3298006

4 Harvil Road, Ickenham UB10 8AJ

- 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 & Mrs Hayer against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 76195/APP/2021/4423, dated 3 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is two-storey side and rear extension; raising of main roof ridge; and alteration to windows on front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two-storey side and rear extension; raising of main roof ridge; and alteration to windows on front elevation at 4 Harvil Road, Ickenham UB10 8AJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 76195/APP/2021/4423, dated 3 December 2021, 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: PA-01; PA-02.
 - 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 development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Harvil Road is characterised by large two-storey detached houses, which are set back from the road within spacious plots featuring established planting. However, there is a large degree of individuality of building style, including significant variation in roof size and form with gable, hipped and crown roofs all present. Some incorporate large dormers or front projections adding further to the variety in the street scene.
4. No 4 is a two-storey detached house with a single-storey attached garage to the side and currently has a part hipped, part Dutch-hip roof. The proposal with its wrap around two-storey side and rear extensions would undoubtedly represent substantial additions to the host building and alter its principle roof form. Nonetheless, the two-storey side extension would be set back 1 metre

from the front elevation with a corresponding lower ridge line. This would achieve an appropriate degree of subservience to the host building when viewed from the road, in compliance with the requirements of Policy DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) (the DMP).

5. The new roof would be comparable to the height of the existing, and although of much greater bulk, would not be harmful in the context of the varied roof sizes and styles of the surrounding houses. Concerns are raised over the use of crown roofs, but these elements would not be overly large, or prominent from the public realm, and in any event are not an uncharacteristic feature of the area.
6. The majority of the massing would be located to the rear of the house, but the properties here have long rear gardens. As such, the extensions would not appear overlarge in the context of the overall plot size. Furthermore, the depth of the extensions would be consistent with other houses along the road and would maintain the spacious rear garden setting.
7. I have taken into account the previous appeal decision at the property. However, the design has changed, and for the reasons given above, I find that the resultant building would not be dominant or out of keeping with the local development pattern and street scene.
8. As such, the development would not cause harm to the character or appearance of the area, and so, complies with the design principles of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHD1 and DMHB11 of the DMP. Amongst other things, these require new development, including extensions, to be appropriate to the local context and to ensure no adverse cumulative impact on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area.

Conditions

9. As suggested in the Council's appeal questionnaire, the standard commencement and approved plans conditions are imposed for certainty. A condition requiring the external materials to match the existing building would ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR