

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2020 by S Witherley

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3253471

56 Long Lane, Ickenham UB10 8TA

- 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 Chris Mouskoundi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 41074/APP/2020/794, dated 11 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 May 2020.
 - The development proposed as described on the application form is single storey side extension at 56 Long Lane, Ickenham, Uxbridge UB10 8TA
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the single storey side extension at 56 Long Lane, Ickenham, Uxbridge UB10 8TA, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 41074/APP/2020/794, dated 11 March 2020, 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 development, hereby permitted, shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Numbers; TP(00) 10; TP (00) 11; TP (10) 30; TP(10)31; TP(10)32; TP(11)30; TP(11)31.
 - 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.

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 main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of appeal property and the area, including whether it preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the Ickenham Village Conservation Area (CA) in which it is located.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site sits within the CA, with its significance, in so far as it relates to this appeal, deriving in part from the age and architectural detailing of properties located in a suburban residential area. The majority of properties are
-

set in large and spacious plots set behind generous sized and mature landscaped front gardens which give a spacious and sylvan character and appearance to the area.

5. No. 56 is a large semi-detached dwelling located at an oblique angle on a shared corner plot overlooking an access road at the junction of Long Lane and Milton Road. The property has a number of prominent architectural features including a steep front gable and a one and a half storey side addition with catslide roof located on the forward part of the flank wall which contains an integral garage.
6. A driveway leads up to the integral garage with the garden area directly to the front of the dwelling comprising of a mixture of grass and mature planting bounded by a low-lying wall that continues along the front of the adjoining neighbour, No. 2 Milton Road. The garden area to the other side of the driveway is enclosed by mature planting and a graduating brick wall that fronts onto Long Lane. Despite this part of the front garden being enclosed the front garden appears open and spacious as a result of its large size.
7. The proposal would be located upon the flank wall which is currently obscured by the mature landscaping at the front of the property. This enclosed area also conceals a large detached outbuilding which is completely obscured from street view. The Council state that this structure does not benefit from planning permission, but it would appear to have been in situ for many years and there is no suggestion that it has ever been subject to any enforcement proceedings. Consequently, I have considered the structure to be an established feature in this part of the garden.
8. As part of the proposal the existing integral garage would be converted to an open plan family room with an area to the side extended out in alignment with the front elevation to accommodate a utility room. The family room would extend out into an open plan dining area set back at an angle from this. This angled section would be off set from the shared boundary with No. 54. Its height would be similar to the lower eaves level of the existing catslide roof.
9. Despite its angled position and crown roof profile not being characteristic of other side extensions that I observed in the surrounding area, its proposed height, overall scale and form ensures that it would appear as a subsidiary addition to the original dwelling. Moreover, given that the angled form would be set back from the main elevation of the original dwelling and off set slightly from the shared boundary, a gap, albeit, a reduced one, would be retained between the proposal, the shared boundary and the existing detached structure, thereby retaining a degree of openness in this area.
10. Views of the proposal would be limited as a result of its siting and the existing boundary treatments. However, the Council are concerned that the surrounding vegetation could be removed in future. Nevertheless, given that the proposed drawings show the existing hedge would be retained I see no reason why it would, particularly given that it is a mature feature that adds significantly to the privacy of the area to the side of the dwelling. Even if it were removed, the majority of the extension is set back from the original front facade and given its subsidiary form would not appear as an overly dominant or juxtaposed addition in relation to the main dwelling or within the wider street scape. Its location to the side of the property also ensures that private views from the surrounding neighbours would not be easily achievable. As such, its design, height and scale ensure that it would appear as a subservient feature in the streetscape. Whilst I

appreciate that the proposal would bring change to the appearance of this area, change does not necessarily equate to harm. Consequently, the effect of the proposed development on this particular part of the CA, and the CA taken as a whole, would be a neutral one and the prevailing character of the CA of substantial, attractive, suburban dwellings set within spacious plots would be preserved.

11. Having regard to the above findings I find the proposed development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the area or the CA. It would comply with the relevant requirements of policies BE1 and HE1 of the A Vision for 2026 Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies (2012) Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2016), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon, Local Plan Part 2, Development Management Policies, all of which seek, amongst other things, to ensure a high standard of design that preserves or enhances the character or appearance of CAs. As the significance of the CA would not be harmed, the development would also avoid conflict with the National Planning Policy Frameworks historic environment conservation requirements.

Other Matters

12. I have considered the Council's argument that the proposal would set a precedent for similar proposals, however, no examples of where this might occur has been provided. In any event, each planning application and appeal is to be considered on its own individual merits. Given that I have found the impact to be acceptable, based on the specific nature of the proposal and its location, I see no reason to conclude that an approval would set a precedent that would cause harm elsewhere. Consequently, a generalised concern of this nature is not sufficient reason to refuse the proposal.
13. The Council in their report mention the planning history on the site and also a planning application¹ that was submitted at the same time as this proposal. However, neither party has submitted any information relating to that application or indeed details of its outcome. Due to the limited information before me I cannot, therefore, give this matter any weight in the determination of this appeal.

Conditions

14. I have imposed the standard time limit condition and have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. A condition is necessary for the materials to match those that are used in the existing property to maintain the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

S Witherley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

¹ 41074/APP/2020/793

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, agree that the appeal should be allowed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR