The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2023

by P Terceiro BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3320411
10 The Mallows, Ickenham, Uxbridge UB10 8BX

- 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 Peter Wright against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 62851/APP/2022/3823, dated 16 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2023.
- The development proposed is a double storey side extension and single storey front extension. Removal of tile hanging on existing house and replacement with white render finish.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double storey side extension and single storey front extension at 10 The Mallows, Ickenham, Uxbridge UB10 8BX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 62851/APP/2022/3823, dated 16 December 2022, 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: Site Location Plan, 21/3444/01A; Site Plan, 21/3444/02A; Proposed Elevations, 21/3444/06A and Proposed Floor Plans, 21/3444/05A.

    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.

    4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the Arboricultural Method Statement dated December 2022 set out in the submitted BS5837 Tree Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement and shall include site supervision in accordance with paragraph 5.4.6 of the statement and the associated appendices.

Preliminary Matter

2. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the development does not comprise changes to the existing materials. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I. This is reflected in my decision above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is located at the end of The Mallows, a cul-de-sac formed by two storey detached dwellings with a similar design and deep frontages. A common feature in these dwellings, as well as in those in Boniface Road, is their forward projecting integral garage beside an enclosed porch with flat roof.

5. The proposed extension would form a continuation of the existing flat roofed projection, extending across the remainder width of the host dwelling in matching materials. Given its limited size and single storey height the proposal would form a proportionate addition to the host dwelling. The design and position of the door and window would relate well to the other openings in the dwelling and result in a visually balanced front elevation. Consequently, the proposal would respect the character of the host dwelling.

6. The proposal would not project beyond the prevailing building line, which would limit its prominence in the street scene. Further, during my site visit I observed that several nearby properties in the vicinity benefit from similar partial flat roofed extensions on their front elevations. I accept that many of these other extensions retain a recessed porch. Nevertheless, in these cases the flat roof oversails the full width of the host dwelling, which is not dissimilar to the proposed extension. As such, the proposal would successfully integrate into its surrounding context and would not appear dominant or intrusive within the street scene.

7. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and area. Accordingly, the proposal would comply with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 – Strategic Policies 2012 (SP) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies 2010. Collectively, these policies seek to achieve good quality design and layout amongst other things.

8. The Council's reason for refusal quotes Policy HE1 of the SP. This policy concerns built heritage and my attention has been drawn to the Ickenham Village Conservation Area (CA). The plan before me shows that the site is located outside the CA. The Council has not set out any reasons to justify the proposal's harm to the CA. Nevertheless, based on the information before me, I am satisfied that the proposal would be acceptable in this regard.

Conditions

9. A condition is necessary to require the development to accord with the approved plans, as this provides certainty and precision. A condition securing matching materials is also necessary, to ensure that the development is in keeping with the existing dwelling and its surroundings. In the interests of protecting retained trees of amenity value a condition is required to ensure that works are undertaken in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Report.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal complies with the development plan read as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate that a decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with it. As such, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

P Terceiro

INSPECTOR