



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2021 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN MIPI

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3260996

17 Sussex Road, Ickenham UB10 8PN

- 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 Neil Jones against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 71253/APP/2020/1624, dated 12 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2020.
- The development is single storey rear extension, porch to front, addition of a bay window on first floor and installation of render.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension, porch to front, addition of a bay window on first floor and installation of render at 17 Sussex Road, Ickenham UB10 8PN, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 71253/APP/2020/1624, dated 12 May 2020, and the plans titled Location Plan, sussexrd-17/0 Rev. F, sussexrd-17/1 Rev. F, sussexrd-17/2 Rev. F, sussexrd-17/3 Rev. F, sussexrd-17/5 Rev. F, sussexrd-17/6 Rev. F, and sussexrd-17/8 Rev. F subject to the following condition:
 1. 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.

Procedural Matter

3. During my site visit, I saw that work was in progress to the rear of the property. This may be in relation to a previously approved scheme, application Ref 71253/APP/2020/2357, or this may relate to the appeal before me which are identical in terms of the works at ground floor. For surety, I have considered the appeal on the basis that it is partly retrospective.

Main Issue

4. The Council consider the porch and single-storey rear extension to be acceptable. I find no reason to disagree. As such, the main issue my recommendation focuses on is the effect of the proposed first-floor extension on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.
-

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse on the eastern side of Sussex Road, a residential street characterised by similar semi-detached pairs.
6. The proposed first-floor extension would be set in slightly from the shared boundary with No 15, have a depth of 1m and would not extend above the eaves of the host building. Due to its limited scale the proposed extension would not overwhelm the original proportions of the host property. Nor would it appear as a particularly unsympathetic addition given the flat roof ground floor extension already permitted at the property, the flat roof dormer already in place and the flat roof rear extensions at the neighbouring houses. Also its discreet siting to the rear of the property away from public views would ensure its impact on the wider area is limited. The proposal would therefore have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.
7. The proposed extension would therefore comply with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (2012), which states that all new development should achieve a high quality of design. The proposed extension would also comply with Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 – Development Management Policies (2020), which state that all new development, including extensions, will be required to be designed to the highest standards, and that flat-roofed two-storey rear extensions will not be acceptable unless the design is in keeping with the particular character of the existing house.

Conditions

8. As I consider the development has commenced, I have not imposed the standard commencement condition. This is in line with the Council's suggested conditions. I have also not imposed the suggested plans condition as I have included reference to them within the terms of the decision.
9. I have found it necessary to impose a condition requiring that the materials used for the external surfaces of the approved extensions must match the host building, in the interests of the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR