
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2017

by AJ Steen BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3172256
6 Hoylake Crescent, Ickenham UB10 8JD

- 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 Gary Collins against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 39401/APP/2016/4396, dated 4 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension at 6 Hoylake Crescent, Ickenham UB10 8JD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 39401/APP/2016/4396, dated 4 December 2016, 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: 161122/01, 161122/02, 161122/03, 161122/04, 161122/05 and 161122/06.
 - 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 proposed extension on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. 6 Hoylake Crescent is a chalet bungalow located at the end of a terrace of chalet bungalows forming a terraced courtyard development, known as Farm Close. The surrounding area primarily comprises a mix of detached and semi-detached bungalows and chalet bungalows. The attached terrace is located to the rear of no. 6, such that it forms a distinctive and relatively prominent property that, along with a similar property to the other side of Farm Close, frames the entrance to the courtyard. The property has been significantly altered in the past, with front dormer windows and single storey extensions to either side of the property.
-

4. The proposed first floor side extension would be above an existing extension and visible in the approach from Copthall Road East. However, the depth and ridge height of the extension would be reduced from that of the existing property. The eaves to the rear would be higher than those to the front, although this would be seen against the backdrop of the existing gable end. These elements ensure that the proposed extension would be subservient to the existing building.
5. The Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions require that first floor extensions should be set at least 1.5m from the property boundary, which is proposed in this instance. This ensures that the proposed extension would be subservient to the existing dwelling in views from neighbouring properties to the rear. The Council suggest that the front elevation of the extension should be set back from the front of the existing dwelling, but the SPD states that in the case of terraced or detached dwellings, there is no specific requirement for a set back from the front of the house. Given the design of the extension, with the ridge lower than that of the existing house, the proposed extension would appear as a subservient extension that would not unbalance the existing, largely symmetrical, property.
6. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension would reflect the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area. As such, it would comply with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies and Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan that seek to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment, through high quality design of development and that development should complement or improve the character of the area.
7. Given that the proposed extension would be above an existing single storey extension, it would not affect the amount of outside amenity space available to residents of the property.

Conditions

8. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. A condition is necessary for materials to match those used on the existing house to maintain the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons and taking into account all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

AJ Steen

INSPECTOR