
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2019

by R Norman BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3232730

52 Breakspear Road South, Ickenham UB10 8HE

- 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 Sunil Malhotra against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 63169/APP/2019/1495, dated 4 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is a part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension at 52 Breakspear Road South, Ickenham UB10 8HE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 63169/APP/2019/1495, dated 4 May 2019, 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: Drawing Numbers SKMPD-P-52BRS-001 Rev C, SKMPD-P-52BRS-002 Rev B and SKMPD-P-52BRS-003 Rev C.
 - 3) 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling set within a row of existing houses. The dwelling is served by a driveway to the front and private garden to the rear. The property has previously been extended to provide accommodation in the roof space including roof lights and two side dormers.
4. The proposed development seeks to achieve additional accommodation through the addition of a part two storey, part single storey, side and rear extension to

provide extended living room and kitchen areas to the ground floor and a larger bedroom and bathroom at first floor. The extension would involve the removal of the existing single storey conservatory.

5. The Council have concluded that the single storey element of the proposed extension would be acceptable, and it is not disputed that the roof would be subservient to the existing main ridgeline. The Council have, however, raised concerns over the design of the double hip roof profile that is proposed to the rear two storey extension.
6. Whilst a double roof profile is not a common feature of the surroundings, the nearby dwellings have some variation in their roof styles. There are other hip roof elements visible on some of the nearby properties and the host property itself has a combination of roof styles. As a result of the varied roof forms of the existing dwelling and nearby properties I find that the proposal would not appear out of character to a degree that would be unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling or the surroundings.
7. Consequently, whilst elements of the proposal do not comply wholly with the guidance in the Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions, the proposed development would comply with Policies BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (2012) and BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Saved UDP Policies (2012). Collectively, these seek to achieve high quality design which should harmonise with the scale, form and architectural composition of the original building and complement or improve the character of the area, amongst other things.

Other Matters

8. I have had regard to the Appellant's points in relation to the flat roofed option submitted previously and have seen the related plans. However, as this appeal relates to the subsequent scheme with the hip roof design, I do not have the full details of the flat roofed scheme before me and therefore cannot conclude on this matter.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit condition I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as this provides certainty. A condition for the materials to match the existing property is necessary in the interests of the visual character of the host property and the surroundings. The Council have indicated in their questionnaire that they do not consider any additional conditions to be necessary.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R Norman

INSPECTOR