



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2019

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3236063

12 Edinburgh Close, Ickenham UB10 8RA

- 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 Christopher Patman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 3191/APP/2019/1361, dated 23 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is described on the planning application form as "alterations to front porch and erection of tiled roof to front elevation - revised retro application".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations to front porch and erection of tiled roof to front elevation at 12 Edinburgh Close, Ickenham UB10 8RA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3191/APP/2019/1361, dated 23 April 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: DWG Nos. 0419/CP/01, 0419/CP/02, 0419/CP/06 and 0419/CP/08.
 - 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.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application. In the decision I have removed the reference to the retrospective nature of the application as this is not an act of development.
3. I saw that a development had commenced at the appeal site but that this did not reflect the proposed altered elevations, particularly in respect of the design

of the roof. I have proceeded to consider this appeal on the basis of the proposed altered elevations¹ as submitted.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site consists of one of a pair of semi-detached houses. The proposal would involve the construction of walls under a front canopy to create a porch and the erection of a hipped roof across the canopy and bay window. Whilst this would change the generally symmetrical relationship with the adjoining dwelling, the alterations would be minor in scale and would not be incongruous or overdominant features on this residential property or in respect of its adjoining neighbour. Moreover, based upon what I have seen and read, the symmetrical relationship had previously been affected to a degree by the differing design of the upper floor windows and a pre-existing porch under the canopy.
6. I also saw that there are a mixture of dwelling types and designs in the streetscape, some including features and alterations which reflect the design of the proposal. Within this varied context I do not consider that the proposal would appear as an obtrusive or incongruous addition to the streetscape.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host building or the wider area. The proposal would therefore not conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies 2012; Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies 2012; and the advice of the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions, which together require development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment and overall street scene, amongst other things.
8. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition relating to materials in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. Whilst the proposal is described as being retrospective, I saw that the development as built did not reflect the proposed plans. I have considered the appropriate conditions on that basis – there are other procedures available to address issues which may arise from the extant development.
9. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all material planning considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR

¹ DWG No. 0419/CP/06