



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2021

by Julie Dale Clark BA (Hons) MCD DipTP DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3268759

9 Pepys Close, Ickenham UB10 8NL

- 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 Hardeep Soor against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 38328/APP/2020/3166, dated 29 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension, part 1st floor rear double storey extension, raise extg. single storey side extension incl. addition of glass roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider that the main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ickenham Village Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is within the Ickenham Village Conservation Area and therefore I have had regard to Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. This is reflected in Local Plan Part 1 Policy HE1¹, Local Plan Part 2 Policies DMHB 1 and DMHB 4², London Plan Policy HC 1³ and the National Planning Policy Framework⁴.
4. No 9 Pepys Close is a detached house in a residential area where there is a grouping of houses of similar design. Collectively they form a something of a cohesive identity although there are other designs of houses close by. The house is described as 'chalet style' and comprises of low eaves and a high ridge with hipped gabled. It also has original dormers set into the roof to the front and rear.

¹ London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies (Adopted November 2012).

² London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies, Adopted Version 16 January 2020.

³ Mayor of London The London Plan – The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, March 2021 Policy HC 1 supersedes Policy 7.8 of the 2016 London Plan.

⁴ Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government National Planning Policy Framework, February 2019 (the Framework).

5. A major part of the proposal includes a two-storey extension to the rear of the house. This would be below the existing ridge but would alter the shape of the roof quite considerably. The pitch of the rear extension bears no reference to the original roof and the new gable would significantly alter the character and appearance of the house. Whilst the proposal would remove an existing conservatory and would increase the living accommodation within this dwelling, I consider that the proposal would be substantially at odds with the original design. I appreciate that the original house presents something of a design challenge in enlarging it, however, given the heritage status of the area, the need to find an acceptable design is especially important.
6. I am aware that the extension would be to the rear of the house and so not effect the street scene. However, I agree with the Council that a Conservation Area is not just designated as a series of street scenes and the lack of public views does not lessen the heritage value. I note the matters raised by the appellant with regard to other development in the area but these do not alter my conclusion. I have also taken into account all other matters raised including the design policies referred to.
7. I conclude that the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ickenham Village Conservation Area, it would conflict with the policies referred to above and therefore the appeal fails.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR