
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2017

by Oliver Blower MA (T&CP)

a person appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3179741
62 The Drive, Ickenham UB10 8AQ

- 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 Velani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 38634/APP/2016/2981, dated 3 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as "*single storey front, part first floor rear extension. New roof including rooms in the roof. Front velux and rear dormer windows*".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the single storey front, part first floor rear extension, new roof including rooms in the roof, front velux and rear dormer windows at 62 The Drive, Ickenham UB10 8AQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 38634/APP/2016/2981, dated 3 August 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, 16_90_01 Rev A, 19_90_02 Rev A, 16_90_03, 16_90_04 Rev A, 16_90_05 Rev A, insofar as they are relevant to the scheme depicted in 16_90_06 Rev D.
 - 3) Notwithstanding condition two, no development shall take place until details of the ground-floor, first-floor, second-floor and roof have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, matching the scheme shown in plan 16_90_06 Rev D. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 4) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. A revised elevations plan (ref. 16_90_06 Rev D) was submitted to the Council during the course of the original application. This reduced the width of the first-floor and roof of the proposed two-storey rear extension, removed one of the proposed rear dormers, and added a sixth rooflight to the front of the house. I note, however, that revised floor and roof plans were not provided.
-

Nonetheless, it is clear that the Council took the revised scheme into consideration and I shall do the same with this appeal. I am content no party would be prejudiced by doing so, as the revised plan has reduced the scale of the proposal and the addition of a single roof light is minor.

Main Issue

3. I acknowledge third party concerns with respect to the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to daylight and privacy. It is clear from the Council's officer report and single reason for refusal, however, that the decreased width of the revised two-storey rear extension would not lead to a harmful reduction in daylight to the rear habitable room windows of 60 The Drive, and the proposed new windows would face front and rear so as not to cause an increased loss of privacy. From my own observations, I see no reason to disagree. I therefore consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and immediate area.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a large two-storey detached house with substantial front and rear gardens. The immediate area is characterised by sizeable detached houses of varying design, located on generous open and verdant plots.
5. The development plan includes the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies, November 2012 ('LP') and the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – UDP Saved Policies, November 2012 ('LP saved policies').
6. Policy BE1 of the LP seeks to ensure, in part, that all new development should achieve a high quality of design in all new buildings, alterations and extensions and the public realm, which enhances the local distinctiveness of the area and contributes to community cohesion and a sense of place.
7. LP saved policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 seek to ensure, amongst other matters, that the layout and appearance of new development should harmonise with the existing street scene or other features of the area, and with the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the original building; and complements or improves the character of the area.
8. Further guidance is given in the Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions (SPD). This recommends, amongst other things, that two-storey rear extensions should always be designed so as to appear subordinate to the original house.
9. The proposal is for a single-storey front extension, a first-floor rear extension, the conversion of the roof space to habitable use, one rear dormer window and six front rooflights. It is clear from the evidence before me that the Council consider the single-storey front extension and the six front facing rooflights to be acceptable and, from my own observations, I have no reason to disagree. I therefore focus on the first-floor rear extension and dormer window.
10. Notwithstanding that the roof of the first-floor extension would match the roof height of the original house; the extension would be set back one metre from the existing two-storey rear projection, its width would be modest in comparison to the house, and the single dormer window would be of small scale. These features, together, ensure the development would not appear

bulky or dominant, thereby achieving an appropriate degree of subservience to the original house. In addition, by virtue of its reduced scale, the proposal would not undermine the open character of the immediate area.

11. Although the extension would have a crown roof, this would not be readily apparent from the public or private realm; where the flat element would be hidden from view and the slope of the roof would complement that of the original house.
12. As a result, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the character or appearance of the host building or immediate area. As such, it would accord with LP policy BE1, LP saved policies BE13, BE15 and BE19, and advice in the SPD.
13. I therefore allow the appeal and grant planning permission subject to the standard implementation condition, a condition requiring compliance with the approved plans, and a condition requiring the use of matching materials, in the interests of good planning and the character and appearance of the area. For reasons made clear in the procedural matters, it is also necessary to impose a condition requiring that details of the floor and roof plans are submitted to and approved in writing by the Council, which reflect the scheme depicted in revised drawing 16_90_06 Rev D as that is the development that has been assessed for this appeal.

O Blower

Appointed Person