



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2022

by A Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3297906

66 The Drive, Hillingdon, Ickenham UB10 8AQ

- 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 Jashvant Valand against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 4011/APP/2022/313, dated 3 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 31 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of single-storey and first floor front and rear extensions. Erection of front porch. Conversion of roof to crown roof to include 2 rear dormers and 8 roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of single-storey and first floor front and rear extensions. Erection of front porch. Conversion of roof to crown roof to include 2 rear dormers and 8 roof lights at 66 The Drive, Hillingdon, Ickenham UB10 8AQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 4011/APP/2022/313, dated 3 February 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2021/187-05; 2021/187-06; 2021/187-07; 2021/187-08; 2021/187-09; 2021/187-10; 2021/187-11.
 - 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.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the proposal varies between the application form and the Council's decision notice, but neither of these accurately describe the proposal. As a result, I have used the revised description that was suggested by the appellant which more accurately reflects the scheme that is before me.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The Drive is a residential street characterised by mainly two-storey detached houses, which are set back from the road within long spacious plots. Some of

the houses are substantial in size, and many appear to have undergone alteration and extension, including in the form of front projections, crown roofs and dormers. As a result, there is a wide variety of building style and design which adds to the distinctiveness of this residential area.

5. No 66 is a two-storey detached house of relatively bland appearance when compared to many of its larger neighbours. Planning permission was previously granted on appeal¹ for extensions and roof alterations that would significantly change the size and appearance of the house in a style not too dissimilar to the current scheme. The Inspector commented that the significant variation in style and design within the street provided scope for extending and altering the property so as to improve its appearance, even where this would not reflect the existing design and appearance of the building. Although the planning permission has now expired, the appeal decision remains a relevant consideration in my assessment of this appeal.
6. The Council's delegated report points to a number of differences in the design of the proposal compared to the previous appeal scheme. I note that the front gable would be full height and would contain a large feature window at the top. In front of it would be a porch canopy with a balcony above. However, the gable would have only a very modest projection, and the porch would be mainly open. Together with the deep frontage at the property and the existence of other nearby forward projections in the street, including at Nos 64 and 62, they would not be unduly dominant or intrusive elements.
7. Furthermore, the overall proportions and composition of the front elevation would have a balanced and coherent form, and I do not consider that the feature window in the gable would result in the appearance of a three-storey house given its position in relation to the eaves and roof slopes. I am also mindful that decision makers should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes in an area where there is no strong justification.
8. Concerns were also raised over the roof alterations, which would include a new crown roof and rear dormers. However, crown roofs feature on numerous other properties along The Drive and in surrounding streets, with the effect that the proposed elongated roof form would not appear at odds with the established character and appearance of the area. In addition, the dormers would be subservient to the overall size of the roof, set well down from the ridge, and in any event, would be confined to the rear where they would not be readily apparent from the public realm.
9. Overall, whilst the proposal would significantly alter the appearance of the house, it would be achieved in an appropriate manner in terms of design, size and massing, and as a result, could be comfortably accommodated in the varied street scene.
10. As such, the development would not cause harm to the character or appearance of the surrounding area, and so, complies with the design principles of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (2012), and Policies DMHD1, DMHB11 and DMHB12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020). Amongst other things, these require new development, including extensions, to be appropriate to the

¹ APP/R5510/D/13/2204817

local context and to ensure no adverse cumulative impact on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area and public realm.

Conditions

11. As suggested in the Council's appeal questionnaire, the standard commencement and approved plans conditions are imposed for certainty. A condition requiring the external materials to match the existing building would ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR