

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 August 2017

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3173279

3 Almond Avenue, Ickenham, Uxbridge, UB10 8NA

- 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 G Holland against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 50913/APP/2016/4497, dated 15 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side and rear extension at 3 Almond Avenue, Ickenham, Uxbridge, UB10 8NA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 50913/APP/2016/4497, dated 15 December 2016, 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 used in the existing building.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: 3779/01.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 1930s two storey detached home with a hipped roof and double height bay at the front. It is nicely proportioned and of pleasing appearance. It lies within a row of 4 similar dwellings and the wider area is one of established residential character with a range of buildings and spaces which come together to create an attractive neighbourhood. The appeal scheme is to form a 'wrap around' extension to provide increased living space with a side projection of about 1.8 metres and a rear projection of around 3.6 metres.
-

4. The site lies within the Ickenham Village Conservation Area. There is a duty imposed by Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requiring decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. Policy BE4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) (UDP2) broadly reflects this.
5. The Council is concerned that by reason of its siting, size, scale, bulk and design the scheme would be detrimental to the appearance of the original dwelling, the visual amenities of the street scene and would fail to either preserve or enhance local character and appearance. From a number of aspects the composition and scale of the proposed extension would meet the guidance of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: *Residential Extensions* (SPD) however there would be specific conflict with this document over the point of a set-back from the front elevation. The scheme would be only set back from the bay feature and not the main front walling. Furthermore the Officer report highlights the lack of any gap to the side boundary and the form of this wrap around structure which would have no regard to the original house plan. The Council notes the almost mirrored scheme which exists alongside at No 2 but makes the point that this was permitted in an earlier policy context and additionally that its existence would lead to a terracing effect if the appeal scheme were to be allowed.
6. Taken in isolation, and particularly viewing a side elevation on a plan, this might appear a large extension lacking in some finesse. However this is an unusual situation and for my part I would say that one should not discount what lies immediately alongside whenever it was constructed. The two extensions would sit comfortably together, the sides shielding each other, and being of low profile this ground floor level abutment would not be perceived as terracing. The main frontage of the appeal property would still be read as such even without a set-back and it would be quite legible as original building without any great distraction from the narrow side addition. This relative narrowness of addition to the front elevation is very much a mitigating factor to my mind; the frontage would not be disproportionally extended and the host properties and streetscene qualities would be maintained.
7. The length of the side run would simply not be visible due to the abutment from next door's extension. The rear projection into the back garden would not be excessive by SPD standards or other assessment in my view and would be of simple and suitable design. The abutment of the side and rear extensions in wrap around form is something I would acknowledge may not be generally encouraged but in this instance would work in visual terms, would shield the neighbouring additions, would not distract from the upper level main elevations, and would facilitate a layout which to a degree would still reflect the original house plan.
8. Having regard to the foregoing I conclude that there would not be conflict with S72(1) of the Act or UDP2 Policy BE4; there would be preservation of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Additionally, the scheme would not run contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) or Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the UDP2. These policies, and the SPD which cannot cover every eventuality in its detailed guidance, share common themes of seeking to protect or

enhance the character and appearance of buildings and their neighbourhood, to ensure harmonious development and protection of local distinctiveness.

Conditions

9. The Council suggests the standard commencement condition along with the requirement for materials to match the existing building. I agree this latter condition would be appropriate in the interests of visual amenity. I also agree that there should also be a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plan; to provide certainty.

Overall conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR