



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2025

by **Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/25/3359587

43 The Avenue, Ickenham, Hillingdon UB10 8NR

- 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 Mariam Radi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref is 79051/APP/2024/2554.
- The development proposed is a single storey wraparound extension, a part double storey side and rear extension with crown roof, internal alterations, a new garage space, new windows and skylights to match the existing style.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey wraparound extension, a part double storey side and rear extension with crown roof, internal alterations, a new garage space, new windows and skylights at 43 The Avenue, Ickenham, Hillingdon UB10 8NR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 79051/APP/2024/2554, 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 drawings: TA-R00-EX-102 Rev R00, TA-R00-EX-103 Rev R00, TA-R00-EX-104 Rev R00, TA-R00-EX-105 Rev R00, TA-R00-EX-106 Rev R00, TA-R00-PR-101 Rev R00, TA-R00-PR-102 Rev R00, TA-R00-PR-103 Rev R00, TA-R00-PR-104 Rev R00, TA-R00-PR-105 Rev R00, TA-R00-PR-106 Rev R00, TA-R00-PR-107 Rev R00 and TA-R00-PR-108 Rev R00.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. In December 2024, after the Council issued its decision, a new version of the National Planning Policy Framework was published ('the Framework'). It is that version that I refer to in my reasoning.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area, including whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ickenham Village Conservation Area ('the IVCA').

Reasons

4. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that, in respect of development affecting conservation areas, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing their character or appearance.
5. The Framework says that great weight shall be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, and that harm to their significance requires clear and convincing justification. Policy HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012) ('HLP1') and Policies DMHB 1 and DMHB 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020) ('HLP2') require proposals to sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets, and to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas.
6. I have not been provided with a conservation area appraisal of the IVCA, and the Council's delegated householder report does not describe its significance. However, I observed that this part of it is broadly characterised by parkland, and detached houses which, as illustrated at Figures 3 to 6 of the Appeal Statement, are substantial in scale. They are set back from the highway on spacious, well-landscaped plots. The buildings are mostly of an individual style, some incorporating architectural embellishments, whilst others such as the host, are much plainer. The individual appearance of the buildings and their spacious, verdant setting, contribute to the IVCA's significance.
7. The proposed side extension would be fairly narrow and set well down from the host's ridge; and its first floor would be set well back from its front face and set in around 1 metre from the plot boundary. Thus, although it would link to an extended porch, and it would re-enforce the building's horizontal emphasis, it would achieve a subordinate appearance in the streetscene, and a degree of articulation which would help to break up the building's mass.
8. The windows to serve bedrooms 2 and 4 would be deeper than the others on its front face, but that slightly awkward appearance would be off-set by the replacement of the rather stark garage door with a matching bay window.
9. Given the existing building's asymmetric roofs, the scheme's largely hipped roofs would not appear incongruous, or result in an overly complex or imbalanced form; and, as noted by the Council, there are crown roofs in the surrounding area. Whilst the rear ground and first floor extensions would add significant bulk, in the context of the diverse form and proportions of other buildings in The Avenue, they would not appear out of place. The resultant building would continue to sit on a very spacious plot, and its rear face would be screened from many public vantage points by garages and flats to the south, and by trees.
10. For these reasons, the scheme would preserve the character and appearance of the IVCA. It would not therefore conflict with HLP1 Policy HE1, or with HLP2 Policies DMHB 1 and DMHB 4, or with Chapter 16 of the Framework. Neither would it conflict with HLP1 Policy BE1, HLP2 Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1, Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), or Chapter 12 of the Framework. Collectively, these set out general requirements for good design, which improves and maintains the quality of the built environment, taking into account the local context and existing character; and for extensions to appear subordinate to the main dwelling, whilst respecting its design and materials.

11. I have considered suggested conditions against the tests in the Framework. As well as the standard time limit, in the interests of certainty, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. In the interests of good design, and to protect the character and appearance of the host property and the IVCA, a condition is also necessary requiring that it be faced with matching materials.
12. For these reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR