



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 August 2020

by D. Szymanski, BSc (Hons) MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3242454
20 Milton Court, Ickenham, UB10 8ND

- 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 A Shkolyk against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref: 74741/APP/2019/2442 dated 22 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 4 metre ground floor rear extension, side extension on ground floor with gap, 2 metre rear first floor extension Arts and Crafts style detailed rear doors.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The planning application was made in the name of Mr & Mrs Shkolyk. However, the appeal is made in the name of Mr A Shkolyk only. I have referred to this in the banner heading and the appeal proceeds on this basis.
3. The London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies (the Part 2 Local Plan) was adopted by the Council on 16 January 2020. It replaces the 2012 saved Unitary Development Plan policies and now forms part of the statutory development plan. The Council has also withdrawn the Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document. Consequently, I have had regard to the newly adopted policies in my decision and the appellant has been provided with an opportunity to comment.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and whether it would either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ickenham Village Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a generously sized link-detached dwelling and plot on the corner of Milton Court and Almond Avenue within the Ickenham Village Conservation Area (IVCA). In this location the IVCA is characterised by and its significance derives from, the rectangular green surrounded by well-preserved

- dwelling with arts and crafts influenced forms, set in generous verdant plots. This includes warm bricks, tiled and rendered elevations set under traditional tiled roofs exhibiting multiple gable and hipped gable roofs.
6. Within the IVCA there is a statutory duty under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing its character or appearance. Paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) (the Framework) requires when considering the impact upon the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification (paragraph 194).
 7. The appeal site contributes to the significance of the IVCA as an attractive well-preserved dwelling retaining original proportions, shapes and architectural style. This includes multiple hipped gables and the original rear wing under a half-hipped gambrel roof. Next door and on the opposite side of the gateway road into Milton Court are dwellings of a similar design. Having three sides of the plot adjacent to the highway results in the appeal site being prominently visible from surrounding footways and dwellings. Consequently, its form and location make an important contribution to the IVCA.
 8. The existing western elevation retains an original characteristic two storey projection set under a hipped side gable. This element is an important characteristic of the visual appearance and original styling of the appeal site and No. 22 opposite. Due to the new extension protruding outward of the western side elevation it adjoins, thereby adding a second uncharacteristic flat roofed single storey projection, it would appear a bulky, dominant and incongruous addition from the street scene. It would significantly and detrimentally alter and detract from the appearance of the western elevation.
 9. The glazed door/window would be large a dominant feature on the rear elevation. It would be significantly out of scale with the characteristic features and appearance of the host property. It would be considerably larger than existing openings and wider than the extended first floor gable eaves. The top part of the glass would be visible through the vegetation above the fence from the street and facing dwellings on Almond Avenue. Although it would allow improved daylight, a reduced area of glass could still provide adequate light. The rear half-hipped gambrel roof is an important feature of this dwelling. The new roof light would be large and out of scale with the rear roof slope in which it would be inserted. It would be a prominent feature that would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the IVCA and the host dwelling.
 10. Due to its height, maintaining the link detached gap, and limited visibility due to being part screened by the rest of the extension and No. 18, I do not find the eastern extent of the ground floor extension harmful. The Council considers the depth and form of the first-floor extension and the other roof lights are acceptable in principle, and the development would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. I see no reason to disagree. Notwithstanding the use of matching materials, this does not mitigate the harm I have found.
 11. I note the Inspector's findings for Ref: APP/R5510/D/18/3199216 at No. 5 Milton Court. However, that plot is adjoined on both sides and to the rear by neighbouring properties. It does not have the same prominence as the appeal

site and makes a different contribution to the IVCA. Furthermore, that extension does not protrude further than the respective flank elevations that it adjoins. Therefore, that proposal and its impacts are materially different to the scheme before me, which I have considered on its own merits.

12. For the reasons set out above, the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and it would result in limited harm to the significance of and fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the IVCA. Therefore, it conflicts with Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB1, DMHB4, DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1 of the Part 2 Local Plan, and Policy 7.8 of the adopted London Plan (March 2016). These require development is of a high standard of design which respects the original dwelling and harmonises with its local context. Development should preserve or enhance the character and appearance of Conservation Areas by sustaining and enhancing their significance and making a positive contribution to local character.
13. Where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. It would provide some additional accommodation, but there is no evidence this is essential to the use of the dwelling. There would also be some energy efficiency benefits, but the level of these from this development would be small. There would be some minor economic benefits from construction, but this would be short lived. The combined public benefits of the development constitute a small public benefit overall, that does not outweigh the harm to character and appearance of the IVCA. Therefore, the development conflicts with paragraph 196 of the Framework. This conflict attracts great weight.

Conclusion

14. The proposed development is contrary to the development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework as a whole, and there are no other considerations, including the policies of the Framework which outweigh this finding. Accordingly, for the reasons given, the appeal should not succeed.

Dan Szymanski

INSPECTOR