
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 September 2021

by Rebecca McAndrew BA Hons, PG Dip Urban Design, MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 October 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3275593

53 Ivy House Road, Ickenham, Middlesex UB10 8NG

- 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 Raman Wadhwa against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application 7342/APP/2021/523, dated 2 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is a part two storey, part single storey rear extension
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part two storey, part single storey rear extension at 53 Ivy House Road, Ickenham, Middlesex UB10 8NG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 7342/APP/2021/523, dated 2 February 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: L01, L02, L03
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Procedural Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the Council's decision notice as it more accurately reflects the appeal proposal than that used on the planning application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area, including the Ickenham Village Conservation Area (IVCA).

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a detached dwelling in a residential area. The site lies within the IVCA. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to have special regard to the

desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of this Conservation Area.

5. The appeal proposal seeks to construct a proposed rear extension, which includes both two-storey and single storey elements. The appeal property benefits from an existing two-storey rear extension and a single storey rear extension was in the process of being constructed when I visited the site. The Council confirms that planning consent has recently been granted for this extension (Ref 7342/APP/2021/228) and that therefore the single storey element of the appeal proposal is acceptable.
6. The proposed extension, in conjunction with the existing extension, would span almost the full width of the dwelling. I recognise that this would be a large structure which would substantially conceal the original rear elevation of the appeal property. However, cumulatively the existing two storey extension and the approved single storey extension, will also be large and will also cover a good proportion of this original rear wall. Therefore, the principle of a good-sized extension which covers a significant proportion of this rear elevation has already been established. Whilst the appeal proposal would add an additional first floor area to this existing approval, this is relatively modest in area. In view of the above, the further loss of a small part of the rear wall would not unduly harm the character or appearance of the dwelling or the area.
7. The hipped roof design of the proposed extension, albeit that it includes a small crown roof element, would respond to the form of the existing hipped roof. I acknowledge that the crown roof would add to the overall bulk of the extension roof. However, given that this design feature would be relatively small in scale and the extension roof would sit to the rear and below the ridge of the main dwelling, the proposed extension roof would not be overly dominant.
8. Whilst I acknowledge that crown roofs are not common to Ivy House Road, this design feature would not be readily visible within the area. The crown roof would be located on the rear of the property and therefore would not be seen within the street scene. Furthermore, due to the angle of view, it would not be perceived from the rear garden of the property or that of adjoining neighbours. Also, views of the appeal proposal would be obscured from properties to the rear by vegetation along the joint boundary. As such, the proposal would accord with Policy DMHD1 which seeks to avoid large crown roofs.
9. Taking all of this into account, I consider that the proposed rear extension would sit comfortably within the context of the existing dwelling and therefore would not unduly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the area. Accordingly, the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the IVCA. The proposal would therefore meet the requirements of policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), policies DMHB1, DMHB4, DMHB11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020, policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and paragraphs 130 and Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Taken together, these seek to secure high quality design that does not adversely affect the character of the host dwelling, area or the historic environment, including the IVCA.

Conditions

10. I impose conditions in regards to timescales and setting out the approved plans to provide certainty. I attach a condition regarding external materials to ensure the scheme preserves the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the IVCA.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR