
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 August 2017

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 8 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3177339

3 Glebe Avenue, Ickenham, UB10 8PB

- 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 and Mrs Arnold against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 72599/APP/2017/562, dated 16 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 9 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is front and rear extension to existing household. Demolition of existing car porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for front and rear extension to existing household and demolition of existing car porch at 3 Glebe Avenue, Ickenham, UB10 8PB, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 72599/APP/2017/562, dated 16 February 2017, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 0186-03-0100 Rev 01, 0186-03-0101 Rev 03, 0186-03-0200 Rev 03, 0186-03-0201 Rev 01, 0186-03-0400 Rev 00, 0186-03-0401 Rev 03, and 0186-00-0500 Rev 01.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 3 Glebe Avenue is a detached bungalow in an established residential area. It is within the Ickenham Conservation Area near its eastern edge. The conservation area as a whole has the appearance of a planned garden city, with large detached and semi-detached houses spaced relatively close together and laid out and constructed in a range of styles typical of the early part of the 20th century. They have relatively long rear gardens, with mature trees in both the gardens and on the street giving the area an attractive verdant character.

4. Policies relevant in this appeal are as follows. Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies 2012 (the local plan) require, among other things, that new development should be of a high quality of design and conserve and enhance designated heritage assets such as conservation areas. Saved policies BE4, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan 2007 (the UDP) seek to ensure that development, including extensions, harmonises with and complements the existing street scene and character of the area and the scale of the original building, and preserves or enhances features which contribute to the special qualities of conservation areas.
5. There is a statutory duty under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that in the consideration of development proposals weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets in accordance with the significance of the asset.
6. Glebe Avenue appears to be more recently developed than the main part of the conservation area, and the houses are in a mix of styles not typical of the rest of it. In my view, No. 3 has a neutral impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area. It is a modest L-shaped building of brick and render, the character of which is somewhat diminished by the flat roofed car port in the corner of the 'L'.
7. I consider that the proposed extensions to the rear and side would be acceptable in terms of their size, scale and design. The side extension would fill in the angle of the 'L' currently occupied by the car port. It would be constructed of brick and render to match the existing, with a pitched roof running parallel with, and matching the roof pitch of, the front gable element of the bungalow. It would be set back from the main front gabled elevation and subservient to the main bungalow.
8. The pitched roof would be slightly higher than the 3.4m height recommended for single storey side extensions in the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document *Residential Extensions* 2008 (the HDAS). In my view, the difference is negligible and allows for a better external appearance in respect of the roof pitch than would strict compliance with the advice, and it would be an improvement over the existing flat roof to the car port.
9. The existing bungalow is not typical of the predominant and distinctive styles of the larger houses of the older part of the conservation area and, in my opinion the proposal would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the area.
10. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area and that it would be consistent with policies BE1 and HE1 of the local plan and BE4, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the UDP and the Framework.
11. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

12.I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council, having regard to the tests set out in the Framework. A condition detailing the plans is necessary to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and for the avoidance of doubt. A condition relating to the materials is necessary in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR