



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2017

by R J Jackson BA MPhil DMS MRTPI MCMI

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

Decision date: 06 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3176314

104 Breakspear Road South, Ickenham UB10 8HF

- 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 Simon Boxall against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 70259/APP/2016/4197, dated 14 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as "retrospective application re details of approved extensions here- to retain the as-built clay-tiled open front canopy over the as-approved entrance doorway; also, to retain the existing as-built white rendered first floor gable frontage here; small roof amendment to yet-to-be-built rear single storey extension, reducing volume and introducing small area of red clay tiled roof to one side elevation, to mirror the as-approved other side elevation here."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension, porch to front, conversion of roof space to habitable use to include, two side dormers and conversion from hip to gable end at both front and rear, with four new gable end windows involving demolition of existing porch and raising of ridge height at 104 Breakspear Road South, Ickenham UB10 8HF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 70259/APP/2016/4197, dated 14 November 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 3c, 5c, 6a, 40, 41 and 42.
 - 2) The tiles for the roof on the rear extension shall match those used elsewhere on the existing building.

Background and Procedural matters

2. Planning permission was granted in 2014¹ for "single storey rear extension, porch to front, conversion of roof space to habitable use to include, two side dormers and conversion from hip to gable end at both front and rear, with four new gable end windows involving demolition of existing porch and raising of ridge height". In 2015 a non-material minor amendment to that permission under Section 62A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) was approved² "to allow for amendments to fenestration to rear at first floor level and changes from tile to render to side/rear at first floor level".

¹ Council Ref: 70259/APP/2014/3055

² Council Ref: 70259/APP/2015/3821

3. The development was not constructed in accordance with the approved plans, and the appeal application was made to regularise this as well as proposing further alterations. In the decision notice refusing planning permission the Council described the development as "Amendments to fenestration at first floor level, extension of canopy to front, amendment to roof of single storey rear element involving alterations to elevations (Part-Retrospective)".
4. In the Committee report on the application three alterations from the approved scheme (that is the 2014 permission together with the 2015 non-material minor amendment) are identified. These are an alteration on the northern side of the rear single storey extension to provide a lean-to section of roofing to be clad in tiles, the first floor front elevation rendered and painted white, and the canopy (a tiled lean-to section on the front elevation above the ground floor windows and doors) extended across essentially the whole width of the property.
5. At the site visit it is was clear that the second and third alterations had been completed but the first had not³. The development as a whole is for "single storey rear extension, porch to front, conversion of roof space to habitable use to include, two side dormers and conversion from hip to gable end at both front and rear, with four new gable end windows involving demolition of existing porch and raising of ridge height" which is the same description as the 2014 permission, except that the drawings are different. I have therefore used this description in my formal decision.
6. The reasons for refusal only relate to the alterations to the front elevation and I can see no objection to the proposed alteration to the rear, being the first element described above.

Main Issue

7. In light of all of the above the main issue is the effect of the alterations to the previously permitted development on the front elevation on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

8. The appeal property is set in a row of detached dwellings set on a service road behind Breakspear Road South with the service road being separated from Breakspear Road South itself by a vegetated strip of land so that the properties in this section cannot be readily seen from the main road. Generally the properties are two-storeys in height although there are some bungalows. On the front elevations the materials of the buildings follow a similar palette being red/brown tiles and bricks, with white joinery to the windows.
9. As a bungalow which has been converted into a chalet style dwelling the appeal property is somewhat different in form to the two storey dwellings which are more vertical in design approach with their gables and, particularly, bay windows.
10. The Council has referred to the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions (December 2008) (the HDAS). This was adopted following public consultation and is written so as to provide clear and unambiguous guidance on the types of residential extensions and alterations

³ This could be seen over the canopy from the bank on the opposite side of the road.

which are likely to be considered acceptable. As this is in accordance with paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which indicates that decisions should aim to ensure that developments respond to local character, reflecting the identity of local surroundings, I am able to give this significant weight.

11. The HDAS states that the Council will normally refuse front extensions which extend across the whole width as they are considered eye catching and change the face of the building affecting the character of the building and the street scene.
12. A canopy has been previously permitted across the majority of the width of the property, with the only section not permitted being that on the right hand side when facing the property, to create an open porch.
13. Because the property is now a chalet bungalow it has a somewhat different character to the two-storey properties in the area not having the more vertical design features described above. The extension of the canopy across the whole width of the property reflects this different character, so that while is different it is not discordant in the street scene and harmonises with the street scene by creating a satisfactory visual relationship; harmony does not require uniformity. In addition, the canopy pulls together the front elevation as an architectural piece and is therefore not out of character with either the building or street scene when considered as a whole.
14. Above is the white painted gable. As noted earlier in this decision the palette of materials in the immediate area is predominantly red/brown and to that extent the development as completed does stand out in the street scene. However, as with the canopy extension, this is not discordant and harmonises with the street scene. The ground floor, including the canopy, is constructed from red/brown bricks and tiles which mean that the building fits within the wider palette of materials, and the white painted render is a relatively small area located within the triangle created beneath the apex of the gable. It provides a contrast and creates interest.
15. As such I am satisfied that the alterations to the front elevation are not out of character with the character and appearance of the area. Consequently it complies with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) which requires new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment enhancing local distinctiveness and a sense of place. It would also comply with Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - UDP Saved Policies (November 2012) in that it would harmonise with the existing street scene, scale, form, architectural composition and proportions, and would complement the character of the area. While the proposal would be contrary to the precise requirements of the HDAS I am satisfied that it complies with its wider aims of ensuring that changes and extensions to the front of the house do not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street. It would also comply with paragraph 58 of the Framework as set out above.

Conditions

16. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council against the requirements of the national Planning Practice Guidance and the Framework. As the development has been commenced there is no need for a condition

specifying by when development must be begun. However, due to the prospective nature of the rear alteration I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty and also imposed a condition requiring the materials of the proposed alteration of the rear to match the tiles on the existing building.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

RJ Jackson

INSPECTOR