
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2017

by Mike Fox BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3166615

2 Haslam Close, Ickenham, Uxbridge, UB10 8TJ

- 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 Nicola Mitchell against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 35785/APP/2016/3253, dated 30 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is part two storey, part single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for part two storey, part single storey side extension at 2 Haslam Close, Ickenham, Uxbridge, UB10 8TJ in accordance with the terms of application Ref 35785/APP/2016/3253, dated 30 August 2016, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, all prefaced with 160729 : 01 *Location Plan*; 02 *Site Plan*; 03 *Survey*; and 04 *Proposed*, all dated by the Council as received on 30 August 2016.

Procedural Matter

2. The Appellant's planning application is dated 17 November 2017, i.e. after the date of the Decision Notice. I have therefore dated the application to when it was received by the Council, which can be found in its Decision Notice.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey end-of-terrace dwelling which is located within a compact, triangular shaped plot. It is situated in a residential close

- which is characterised by similar, terraced properties with staggered building lines, some of which come close to the road.
5. The Council considers that the proposed development would be unduly intrusive and incongruous within the streetscene and would not appear sufficiently subordinate to the existing dwelling.
 6. The proposed side extension would be set back from the forward-most building line of the existing house, continuing the pattern of staggered building lines in the close. Its roof would be set down from the existing ridge height, and its lower roof above the ground floor would also be subservient to the corresponding roof on the host building. The length of the street frontage of the house would be extended by just over a quarter. I therefore consider in terms of its roof form and height, massing and disposition, that the proposal would be subordinate to the host dwelling.
 7. Furthermore, the design of the proposed extension, including the shape and pitch angle of the main roof and the lower roof above the ground storey; the matching eaves lines; the dimensions, orientation and shape of the windows; and the proposed external materials, would all reflect the character and appearance of the host building. I therefore do not regard the appearance of the proposed extension as “unduly intrusive” or “incongruous” either in relation to the existing dwelling or on the streetscene, where the loss of openness would be negligible, as its location is some way distant from the corner with Aylsham Close and is not particularly prominent.
 8. Taking account of the above considerations, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the streetscene. As such it would accord with Local Plan¹ policy BE15, which aims to ensure that alterations to existing buildings harmonise with the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the original dwelling. It would also be in line with the design aims of Local Plan policies BE1, BE3 and BE19, and the design parameters of section 7 of *the Framework*². The proposal would also meet the more detailed requirements for two storey side extensions which are contained in Section 5 of the Hillingdon Supplementary Planning Document, entitled *Residential Extensions*.
 9. The Council has not suggested any additional conditions to those which appear in the standard questionnaire, and neither do I. Condition (2) is to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.
 10. In conclusion, I have found that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the existing house and neither would it harm the streetscene. It would therefore accord with national policy and the development plan. For the reasons given and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Mike Fox

INSPECTOR

¹ London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan, Part one – Strategic Policies and Part two, Saved UDP Policies; November 2012.

² DCLG: National Planning Policy Framework (*the Framework*); March 2012.