



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2020

by Graeme Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 26 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3245899

79 Field Close, Ickenham UB10 8JQ

- 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 Neale Whittall against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 10747/APP/2019/3058, dated 16 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey side and rear extension, hip to gable end and rear dormer roof extension and erection of detached double garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the single storey side and rear extension, hip to gable end and rear dormer roof extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the erection of detached double garage, and planning permission is granted for erection of detached double garage at 79 Field Close, Ickenham UB10 8JQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 10747/APP/2019/3058, dated 16 September 2019, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and 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 only insofar as they relate to the detached double garage: site location plan; 01; 02; 03; 06; 07 and 08.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the detached double garage hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Procedural Matters

2. In the time since the Council refused planning permission for the proposed development it has adopted the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies¹ (LP2). Policies DMHB11, DMHB14 and DMHD1 of the then emerging LP2 were referred to in the Council's reasons for refusal, alongside policy BE1 of Local Plan Part 1 – Strategic Policies (LP1) and the now superseded policies BE13, BE15, BE19 and BE38 of the Local Plan Part 2: Saved UDP Policies 2012.

¹ Adopted 16 January 2020

3. The appeal was submitted after the Council's adoption of LP2 and so I am satisfied that the appellant has had the opportunity to frame the grounds of appeal accordingly. I have therefore determined the appeal accordingly.
4. For the reasons that follow, I find the proposed detached double garage to be acceptable and it is clearly severable both physically and functionally from the proposed single storey side and rear extension and hip to gable end and rear dormer roof extension. I therefore intend to issue a split decision in this case and grant permission for the detached double garage.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the Field Close streetscene.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is one half of a pair of semi-detached properties in a small residential cul-de-sac located off Hoylake Crescent. Access to the cul-de-sac is taken between two properties which front on to Hoylake Crescent via a narrow spur road which opens out to a small circular turning head, around which three pairs of semi-detached bungalows are located.
7. The bungalows are characterised by their square-plan bay windows with projecting gable peaks above. The appeal property, like four of the other five bungalows in Field Close, currently retains a hipped roof. The exception to this rule being the appeal property's adjoining half, which has previously been extended with a hip-to-gable extension.
8. The appeal proposal contains a number of elements in addition to a hip-to-gable elevation, including a single storey side and rear extension and a detached garage. The Council's reasons for refusal refer specifically to the side and rear extension (with the inclusion of front extension in the wording of the first refusal reason) and to the detached garage, which I will deal with in turn before returning to the hip-to-gable extension element.
9. The proposed side and rear extension would be a large addition to an otherwise modest semi-detached bungalow. Although it would not have a particularly large rearward projection, the side extension's width would be significant and would exceed half the width of the original property, contrary to LP2 policy DMHD1(C)(i) when viewed from the front, and would entirely subsume the existing property's rear and side elevations. Despite the small area of pitched roof which would run around the extension's perimeter, the proposal would incorporate a significant area of flat roof. This would introduce an incongruous roof form which, because of its form and extent, would dominate the resulting building, to the overall detriment of the building's character.
10. Although the overall width of the extension when viewed from the front would be broken up to an extent by a healthy set-back, there would be a sizeable element of the extension flush with the front of the main house. Whilst this would be set back from the projecting bay window, its positioning relative to the bay would nevertheless undermine the visual prominence of the bay and thus the character of the bungalow. Despite the varying degrees to which this, and other properties within Field Close have been extended and altered, the primacy of the bay windows has been largely retained. Any extensions towards

the side and rear of the property were, with one exception, set back from the front corner of the bungalows.

11. Views into Field Close, and particularly of the appeal property, are restricted to a degree until past the visual pinch-point created by the boundary fences alongside the spur leading into the turning head itself. The appeal property, and particularly the side of the property and the location of the proposed side extension, thus gradually reveal themselves around the substantial boundary fence at the side and rear of 81 Hoylake Crescent.
12. The visual impact of the scale and width of the proposed extension, and its relationship with the existing main building, would not therefore be fully felt until once in the turning head itself. However, once at the turning head, the scale of the side extension relative to the host building would be instantly seen and keenly felt. The visible extent of the property would be greatly increased and the modest proportions of the existing building would instead be subsumed by the sprawling side extensions proposed.
13. For the reasons I have set out, the proposed side and rear extension would fail to secure design of the highest standard. The width, overall scale relative to the main house and expanse of flat roof would fail to adequately take into account the scale, character and appearance of the host property and of those around it. The extension would fail to appear subordinate to the main house in terms of its scale and form, whilst the extension would erode or fail to take into account local context and characteristic features such as the square-plan bay windows, set back side extensions and the general sense of shared character between houses at the head of the cul-de-sac. The side and rear extension is, for these reasons, contrary to LP2 policies DMHD1 and DMHB11.
14. The proposed detached double garage would be located towards the rear corner of the extensive front forecourt area at the appeal property. Whilst it would, technically at least, be 'in front of' the main house, it would be neither intrusive nor overbearing. Notwithstanding my conclusions in respect of the side and rear extension, the proposed garage would stand sufficiently apart from the existing bungalow (and indeed apart from the proposed extended bungalow) so as that it would clearly seen as a detached outbuilding.
15. As already described above, the appeal site, and particularly the rear corner of the front forecourt, are screened from view on approach by the narrow spur road leading into the cul-de-sac and the fence along the side and rear of 81 Hoylake Crescent. The garage would be tucked away behind this fence, adjacent to garden boundaries with neighbouring properties on Hoylake Crescent. Its dimensions, although generous, would not be excessive and its overall height would not be a dominant feature within the context of Field Close, or when viewed across the generous rear gardens of properties on Hoylake Crescent.
16. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed garage would not cause harm to the character, appearance or visual amenities of Field Close. There would be no conflict with LP2 policies DMHB11 or DMHD1. Nor, noting that the Council do not object to the proposed hip-to-gable extension, do I find any harm arising from this element of the proposal. However, unlike the detached double garage, it is not clear whether this element of the proposal would be clearly severable both physically and functionally from the side / rear extension and so it has to fall alongside it.

Other Matters

17. The appellant states that it would not be necessary to remove any trees within the site to facilitate the proposed development. Nor did I see any trees within the site which would need to be removed and thus lead me to reach a different conclusion.
18. There are however trees and shrubs in the rear gardens of neighbouring properties. Although they create a pleasant backdrop to Field Close they are typical of such residential settings and I have not been advised by either party that they are of particular significance. Nor do I have any particular reason to suspect, notwithstanding the Council's concern at the absence of a detailed tree survey, that the detached garage would cause harm or damage to these trees or their contribution to the visual amenities of the street. Insofar as the proposal relates to the detached garage, I find no conflict with LP2 policies DMHB14 or DMHD1.

Conditions

19. I have considered the suggested conditions set out on the Council's appeal questionnaire in the context of the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. Having regard to my conclusions above and the split nature of this decision, the conditions apply only insofar as the element of the appeal which is allowed.
20. I agree that in addition to time limit and plans conditions, which are necessary in the interests of proper planning and in order to provide certainty, a condition regarding the use of materials in the construction of the detached garage to match those of the main house are necessary in the interests of character and appearance. For the reasons I have set out, a tree condition of the nature suggested by the Council is not necessary and has not been imposed.

Conclusion

21. For the reasons set out, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to the detached double garage and dismissed insofar as it relates to the single storey side and rear extension and hip to gable end and rear dormer roof extension.

Graeme Robbie

INSPECTOR