



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2019

**by Alison Scott BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 3 October 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3231581**

**271 Swakeleys Road, Ickenham, Middlesex UB10 8DR**

- 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 Webb against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref 23510/APP/2018/4255, dated 18 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 28 March 2019.
  - The development proposed is part single part two storey side and rear extensions to existing dwellinghouse.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling set back and behind a high wall and gates on the east side of Swakeleys Road within a suburban area, residential in character. The rear landscaped garden of the appeal property backs onto the access road along Silver Birch Close. The area contains a mix of house types and styles set in generous grounds with the appeal site amongst the largest along this part of the road.
4. The appeal property retains much of its original character with double height bay windows and a projecting peaked gable feature to the front that ties into the hipped roof above. The property has previously been extended, although the original dwelling can still be read and the extensions do not detract from its character. The dwelling also sits comfortably within its plot with a sense of spaciousness all around it.
5. To facilitate the proposal, the attached garage and later additions to the south and rear side of the property would be demolished. The proposed extensions would wrap around the dwelling with a first-floor rear balcony and new roof configuration above the extensions of hipped, and double hipped roofs to the rear.

6. The appellant considers that the design of the development and use of matching materials would result in a balanced, subordinate and harmonising development.
7. However, the extensions proposed would significantly increase the size of the host property, extending both sides of the dwelling close to its boundaries. The Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions 2008 (SPD) advises that the width and height of two storey side extensions in relation to the original house should be considerably less than that of the original house, and between half and two thirds the width of the main house. The combined width of extensions would exceed this limit.
8. Moreover, due to the excessively wide extensions to either side of the front of the property, together with the large expanse of roof above, the scale of extensions would not complement the proportions of the original dwelling. Rather, it would dominate the host property, losing its original identity. In addition, whilst the proposed development may meet required set-backs advised within the SPD, by in-filling most of the space between the property and its boundary on both sides, the large scale of the development would be emphasised and the development would reduce and significantly detract from the spacious setting of the original dwelling.
9. In terms of the SPD's guidance for rear extensions, it specifically states that two-storey rear extensions will be permitted provided there is no significant over-dominance and the roof appears subordinate to the original roof. The extensions' footprint may not significantly exceed that of the existing footprint, however, the scale and massing, and complicated and bulky roof configuration would appear disproportionately larger than the host dwelling and would detract from the visual appearance of the more modest proportions of the host property. It would therefore not appear subordinate to the host property and would be an incongruous and out of character addition to the dwelling.
10. I conclude, therefore, that the development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. As a result, the development would conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies 2012 which requires all new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment including, amongst other matters, enhancing the local distinctiveness of the area. In addition, it would conflict with Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Saved UDP Policies November 2012 which seeks new development to harmonise in terms of scale, form and proportions and to complement or improve the amenity and character of the area. In addition, the proposal would not accord with the SPD as it would not respect the proportions of the host property and its impact would not respond positively to the character and appearance of the area. Finally, I consider the proposal would conflict with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that permission should be refused for development of poor design.

## **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons given above and taking all matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Alison Scott*

INSPECTOR