

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2017

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 14 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3164543

50 Seaford Close, Ickenham HA4 7HN

- 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 Ms Jane Johnson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 22961/APP/2016/2787, dated 11 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of first floor front and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the erection of a first floor front extension. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted insofar as it relates to the erection of a first floor rear extension at 50 Seaford Close, Ickenham HA4 7HN in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 22961/APP/2016/2787, dated 11 July 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) That part of the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1934/1, 1934/2 and 1934/3.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mainly 2-storey house in a residential cul-de-sac along which there are groups of dwellings that are similar in style, age and general appearance. The proposal is to enlarge No 50 with first floor front and rear additions. A small roof light would also be placed onto the front roof slope of the finished dwelling.
-

4. The new front extension would be erected above the existing flat roof single storey projection forming a sizeable 2-storey gable to one side of the front elevation. The new ridgeline would be set noticeably below that of the main house with the eaves broadly level with the existing dwelling. The external materials would match those of the host building.
5. The appeal dwelling stands within a row of similar detached houses along the same side of Seaford Close, most of which include single storey flat roof forward projections at the front and are separated by similar sized gaps. Consequently, there is a broad consistency and a noticeable rhythm to the existing built form in the local street scene to which No 50 belongs, which is locally distinctive. Although there is greater variety elsewhere along Seaford Close with some groups of houses that include 2-storey gables, it is within this line of similar dwellings that the proposal would be visually 'read'.
6. With the new front addition in place, No 50 would be far more substantial in built form than the houses on either side of the site. As a result, the proposal would cause No 50 to significantly gain prominence in the local street scene. The resultant forward projecting 2-storey gable would accentuate the presence of No 50 when seen from the road and this particular feature would clearly set it apart from the properties on either side. As a result, I consider that the completed dwelling would stand uncomfortably within the row of houses and unduly disrupt the distinctive pattern of existing development along this section of Seaford Close. Consequently, it would be obtrusive in the local street scene.
7. For these reasons, I conclude on the main issue that the proposed front extension would materially harm the character and appearance of the local area. As such, it is contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies and Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies. These policies aim to ensure that new development harmonises with the original building and the existing street scene, and complements or improves the character of the area. These principles underpin the advice within the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document, with which the proposal would also conflict.
8. The Council raises no objection to the proposed rear extension, which would be placed above the existing single storey projection. I, too, find this element of the appeal scheme acceptable because it would be appropriate in scale, design and general appearance. This element of the appeal scheme would be at the back of the property, away from Seaford Close, and largely screened in views from Ickenham Road by existing vegetation and so there would be no discernable effect on the area's visual character. The new front roof light would also be a modest addition to the house that would have little effect on the character and appearance of the street scene. Accordingly, the new rear extension and roof light comply with the policies and guidance cited above.
9. As this part of the proposed development is clearly severable to the front extension, which is objectionable, I am able to issue a split decision that grants planning permission solely for it.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings and to require that the rear extension be carried out in accordance with them as this provides certainty. I note that there is a minor discrepancy between the first floor layout and side elevation plans with regard to the new bathroom window. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the finished dwelling, a condition is imposed to require that the external materials match those of the existing building.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and taking into account the absence of objections from others, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed in part and allowed in part.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR