



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2019

by Conor Rafferty LLB (Hons), AIEMA, Solicitor (Non-practising)

Decision by A U Ghafoor BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 2 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3230677

51 Long Lane, Ickenham, UB10 8QU

- 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 Iqbal Randhawa against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 26003/APP/2019/751 dated 4 March 2019 was refused by notice dated 29 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a first storey rear extension and alterations to the side elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ickenham Village Conservation Area (CA).

Procedural Matters

4. The application form refers to the development as a first storey rear extension only. However, the plans also show the installation of a window on the side elevation of the current dwelling. Accordingly, I have taken the description of development from the Council's decision notice which reflects this.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property comprises a large detached dwelling. It benefits from an existing rear extension across the full width of the ground floor and two thirds of the first floor. The proposal relates to a first storey rear extension such that this floor would extend across the full width of the property at the rear.
6. The proposal would be constructed using materials that are in keeping with the design of the appeal property, and fenestration would be in line with the existing windows. However, the resulting extended building would be large and bulky, appearing as unduly prominent within the context of the plot when viewed from the rear garden.

7. While the roofline of the proposal would sit below the current ridgeline, the resulting double pitched design would dominate the rear of the property. The proposal would represent a substantial addition to the dwelling that would fail to harmonise with the scale, form and proportions of the original building, and in particular its rear elevation. Accordingly, the proposal would cause harm to the external appearance of the dwelling.
8. The CA is characterised by its residential nature and the variety of styles of dwelling within the area. There is no distinct architectural design defining the street along which the appeal property is located. Furthermore, views of the proposal would be limited from the front elevation of the house and the surrounding part of the CA. Nonetheless, and as outlined above, the proposal would result in overly dominant development, failing to respect the appearance of the dwelling or the context of the appeal site, which sit within the CA. Accordingly, the proposal would cause visual harm to a designated heritage asset. However, it would only be visible from a very limited section of the CA. As such, this would equate to less than substantial harm in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Nonetheless this harm must still be given considerable importance and weight.
9. From the information provided there are limited public benefits advanced, although the appellant has stated that the proposal represents high quality design. The property would provide a better quality of living accommodation for an elderly family member and live-in carer. However, such circumstances can be afforded little weight in planning terms, and do not override the other considerations identified in this recommendation. Therefore, while the harm to the significance of the heritage assets would be less than substantial the benefits identified are not sufficient to outweigh that harm, particularly when considering the weight to be given to the conservation of these assets.
10. I find that the development would cause harm to the appearance of the property and it would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Accordingly, it would fail to comply with Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies, dated November 2012, Policies BE4, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies, dated November 2012, Policy 7.8 of the London Plan 2016 and the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document on Residential Extensions dated December 2008.

Other considerations

11. The appellant has referred to similar designs being present in the area but has provided limited information or does not show how these are comparable. In any event, the appeal has been assessed on its own merits, based on site-specific circumstances.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. Having had regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Rafferty

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I too agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

A U Ghafoor

INSPECTOR