



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 August 2022 by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by David Smith BA (Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3301084

11 The Greenway, Ickenham, UB10 8LS

- 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 Mrs Brar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref: 19355/APP/2022/1063, dated 30 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of a single storey side and rear extension and erection of a front extension (amendment to 19355/APP/2021/4485).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey side, rear, and front extension at 11 The Greenway, Ickenham, UB10 8LS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 19355/APP/2022/1063, dated 30 March 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing number PA-01.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. However, in the interests of conciseness, for the purposes of the decision I have amended the description of development to 'erection of a single storey side, rear, and front extension'.

Main Issue

4. Planning permission has been given for a side and rear extension of the same dimensions and design as that proposed in this scheme. When I visited the site, this has already begun. The previous proposal also included a front porch. The main issue is therefore the effect of the proposed front extension on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises a detached two storey dwelling within a residential location. An open area adjoins the front elevation of the appeal property with a low wooden fence and large mature tree (which is protected by a Tree Preservation Order) adjoining the appeal site boundary with the highway.
6. This section of The Greenway is characterised by dwellings set well back from the highway. These differ greatly in architecture and materials, affording little consistency to the street scene in these respects. There is also variation in the building line of the principal elevations of these dwellings, with single and two storey extensions projecting beyond the main body of the front elevation. Whilst the host dwelling is similar in appearance to neighbouring 15 The Greenway, there is little similarity with neighbouring 9 The Greenway or other dwellings within the vicinity.
7. The proposed single storey front extension would extend approximately 5.5 metres across the front elevation of the appeal property and project about 1.7 metres beyond the existing principal elevation. This minor forward addition would reflect that of other front extensions within the area. Indeed, the proposed front extension would appear subordinate to the host dwelling because of its modest size. It would not extend across the full width of the property or alter the overall appearance of the house. Whilst the proposal would erode the existing symmetry with No. 15, this is not critical given that the wider street scene is very mixed in appearance and as changes to the front elevation of No. 11 have already been accepted.
8. Policy DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) (HLLP2) contains specific provisions regarding front extensions to residential dwellings. For the reasons given, the proposed front extension would not dominate the character of the street and would be in line with its provisions.
9. I therefore consider that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As well as Policy DMHD 1 of HLLP2, the proposal would comply with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHB 11, and DMHB 12 of HLLP2. Together, these require development to protect the character of the existing built environment and surrounding area.

Conditions

10. I recommend that a condition be imposed requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the interests of certainty. In the interests of the appearance of the area, matching external materials should be secured.
11. As work has already started on the previously permitted side and rear extension there is no need for the standard time limit condition to be attached. The Council refers to a possible condition to safeguard the tree from indirect effects due to construction work. However, this has already commenced and so it would not be effective. Moreover, a condition to this effect was attached to the earlier permission.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. The proposed extension accords with the development plan and there are no other material considerations to indicate that a different decision should be taken. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

N Unwin

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

David Smith

INSPECTOR