



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 January 2020

by Mr D.R McCreery MA BA (Hons) MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3240389

20 Stedman Close, Ickenham, Uxbridge UB10 8DY

- 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 Ms I Douglas against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 31513/APP/2019/2182, dated 23 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Issue

2. The Council considered the original planning application against the policies in their saved Unitary Development Plan which have now been superseded following the adoption of Local Plan: Part 2- Development Management Policies in January 2020. As decisions on appeals are made against the local plan that is in force at the time that the appeal is decided, I have considered the proposed development against the policies in the new Part 2 plan.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2 storey semi-detached dwelling that sits close to the end of a cul-de-sac. The street scene is characterised by modern residential properties of suburban appearance, with some variation in terms of building style.
5. There is a single storey projection attached to the front of the main dwelling that provides a porch and a garage and spans most of the front elevation at ground floor level. The proposed development would extend the single storey projection, matching it in both materials and general design.
6. Whilst modest in scale, when added to the existing porch and garage, the proposed development would result in a single storey projection that spans the full width of the front of the building.

7. As such, I find that the extension would fail to appear subordinate to the main dwelling and would therefore strike an unsatisfactory relationship with it. This would alter the overall appearance of the dwelling in a way that would be harmful to its character and appearance and that of the wider street scene, where front projections are mostly limited to smaller porches and other additions that do not span the full width of the front.
8. I also note that Policy DMHD 1D(i) of Local Plan: Part 2- Development Management Policies says that front extensions across the entire frontage will be refused. This is due to the effect such extensions have on the character of the building and the street scene. The proposed development would be directly contrary to this policy and, for the reasons set out above, I see no reason to set it aside.
9. I acknowledge that the neighbouring 22 Stedman Close, which forms the other half of this pair of semi detached houses, already has an extension that is similar to the proposed development. This is understood to have been constructed some time ago. The presence of similar neighbouring development does not automatically guarantee that planning permission should be granted. In this case, I judge that any benefits from the proposed development in terms of bringing greater symmetry to the two buildings would be outweighed by the harm to the wider street scene that would result from the creation of a full width front extension.
10. For the reasons discussed above I find that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area. Consequently, I find conflict with policies in Local Plan: Part 2- Development Management Policies (2020), in particular DMHB11 and DMHD1 which collectively seek to encourage a high standard of design and include requirements that extensions should be subordinate to the main dwelling and a presumption against full width front extensions.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

D.R. McCreery

INSPECTOR