



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2019 by S Watson BA(Hons) MSc

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3234935

4 Witney Close, Ickenham UB10 8EL

- 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 & Mrs Spencer against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 5926/APP/2019/1170, dated 5 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is part two storey, part single storey extension with rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for part two storey, part single storey extension with rooflights at 4 Witney Close, Ickenham UB10 8EL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 5926/APP/2019/1170, dated 5 April 2019 and 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 approved plans listed: Elevations as Proposed, Ground Floor as Proposed, Roof Plan as Proposed.

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 Council's decision notice makes it clear that its concern relates to the rear two storey extension and not the other elements of the proposal. Accordingly, the main issue in this case is the effect of the two storey rear extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is at the end of a residential cul-de-sac and contains a detached dwelling which is predominantly brick with a brown tile roof. The dwellings within the cul-de-sac are of a similar style but a number have been extended or otherwise altered and so the street is not uniform.
5. The proposed two storey rear extension would increase the bulk of the building and alter its roof shape, introducing a flat roof element below the current ridge line. Whilst this roof form is not a characteristic of the area, it is unlikely that this change would be perceptible in the street scene, given the property's location at the end of the cul-de-sac, and the close relationship of neighbouring properties, which would largely screen the depth of the extended dwelling and the new roof form.
6. Moreover, the rear elevation of the property is largely enclosed by mature landscaping. Whilst the rear elevation of the property in part is visible from Gibson Road to the rear, this is limited to glimpses of the first floor rear windows and roof. The new flat roof part of the roof would be unlikely to be visible from this road, because of its position in the roof, and the rear roof pitch on the new extension would be likely to appear as a continuation of the existing roof design. The gable feature on the rear of the side extension reflects that on the rear extension of the neighbouring property.
7. In light of the foregoing I find that the proposal's impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling would be acceptable. Harm to the character and appearance of the host property would not result. The contribution that the host property makes to the character and appearance of the area would not be diminished. The character and appearance of the area would be preserved. There would be no conflict with Policy BE1 of *A Vision for 2026 Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies*, Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the *London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Adopted 1998) Saved Policies* and the guidance contained within the *Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions*, which collectively require, amongst other things, for development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment and overall street scene.

Conditions

8. The Council has suggested a number of conditions it would wish to see imposed in the event that the appeal was allowed. I have considered the suggested conditions against the advice on conditions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. I have amended some of the suggested wording to reflect this advice.
9. A condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition is necessary to ensure that the external materials of the new extension match those of the existing house.
10. The Council has suggested conditions regarding the landscaping of the site. I find that such conditions would be unreasonable given the nature of the proposal and the landscaped nature of the gardens.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above I recommend that the appeal should be allowed with the suggested conditions.

S Watson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and concur that the appeal should be allowed with the recommended conditions.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR