
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2017

by Mike Worden BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3168701
14 Warren Road, Ickenham UB10 8AA

- 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 H Gill against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 35699/APP/2016/3345, dated 5 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is part 1st floor front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for part first floor front extension at 14 Warren Road, Ickenham UB10 8AA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 35699/APP/2016/3345, dated 5 September 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: Site Location Plan, 16/14/WRI/104, 16/14/WRI/102, 16/14/WRI/103, 16/14/WRI/101
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached house on Warren Road which is characterised by detached properties set in individual plots. The road is tree-lined and has verges both sides. There also trees in a number of gardens and to the rear of the appeal site. The appeal site is covered by a Tree Preservation Order. The area has a spacious suburban feel.
 4. The houses vary in style and size along the road and that variation provides an essential element of the character of the area. The variation is demonstrated by the presence of a thatched roof house immediately adjacent to the appeal
-

property and next to that house there is a house with two front facing gables of quite different styles. The line of houses on the appeal property side of Warren Road is interrupted by entrances to Vyners school and its field.

5. The appeal property has a two storey front gable which extends across around half of its front elevation. The proposal introduces a second gable to the front of the house to provide additional living accommodation. This would effectively fill in the gap above part of the existing single storey element. This gable would extend higher than the existing one but would still sit below the ridge line.
6. The Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document 2008 (the SPD) requires that extensions should be subordinate to the main house and that particular regard needs to be had to front extensions since they can alter the appearance of the house and can be eye catching.
7. The proposed development would alter the appearance of the house since it would lead to a double gable front elevation compared to a single gable at the front at present. This would be a significant change. However, the proposed extension would still remain subordinate to the existing dwelling since it would sit below the roof line; would only extend across part of the front of the house; would not project forward of the building line and would sit on top of an existing single storey part of the house which has a sloping roof. I therefore consider that the proposed extension would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the host dwelling.
8. The variety in house styles and types in this part of Warren Road mean that there is not a predominant design or rhythm, other than one of large detached dwellings in their own plots, set well back from the road. Each house has its own unique design and style, and contributes individually and collectively to the character of the street, along with other features such as the trees and verges. In addition since the appeal property, along with the other houses around, sits back from the street, the additional bulk the proposal introduces is less evident. As a result, I consider that although the proposed development would alter the appearance of the house, it would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the area, and would accord with Policies BE1, BE13, BE15 and BE19, of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan 2012, which set down requirements for new development to respect local character and to harmonise with existing buildings and the streetscene.
10. In reaching this decision I have taken into account the provisions of the SPD, and for the reasons set out above consider that the proposed development would accord with the general aim of encouraging extensions to be subordinate and with the specific guidance on front extensions in section 8.1. I therefore do not find conflict with the SPD.

Conditions

11. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in relation to the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard condition relating to implementation, there is a need to impose a condition specifying the plans to which the permission relates, in the interests of clarity and certainty.

12. There is also a need to impose a condition relating to matching materials in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area.
13. I have considered the Council's suggested condition in relation to tree protection, hard and soft landscaping, external lighting and other matters. In the officer's report, the Council's tree/landscape officer states that the proposal will not have an impact on any tree, protected or otherwise. I therefore do not consider it necessary to impose a condition regarding tree protection.
14. I also do not consider it necessary or appropriate to impose a condition to require landscaping or any other of the elements suggested, given the nature of the proposal which does not extend the building footprint. Such a condition in this case would not be required by the SPD and would not be compatible with the tests set out in the Planning Practice Guidance and the Framework.

Conclusion

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

Mike Worden

INSPECTOR