



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2023

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3325944

14 Warren Road, Ickenham, Hillingdon, UB10 8AA

- 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 Gill against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 35699/APP/2023/1115, dated 16 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 12 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is part single storey, part two storey side/rear and front extension incorporating roof alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a detached two storey dwelling set within a road comprising of mainly detached houses of varying styles and designs. The houses are set well back from the Warren Road which is tree lined and has verges on either side.
4. The appeal site has been the subject of previous planning applications. Of particular relevance to this appeal is an application for first floor and ground floor front extension, ground floor and first floor rear extension, single storey side extension and loft conversion. This proposal was allowed on appeal¹ in January 2023.
5. The current proposal adopts a different design approach to the previous appeal proposal. The existing roof would be replaced by a hipped roof whilst the existing low front gable would be removed and replaced by a higher two storey gable more offset to the eastern side. The proposed front extension would be higher and more visually prominent than the existing gable but it would remain subordinate to the host dwelling. Given the varied character and appearance of Warren Road, the proposed elevational changes to the front of the dwelling would not result in any material harm.

¹ Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3304320

6. The proposed two storey rear extension, together with the loft conversion and alterations to the roof of the dwelling would however add considerably to the bulk and mass of the dwelling compared to the earlier appeal proposal.
7. The proposed rear elevation would extend across the full width of the dwelling and would fully obscure the existing rear elevation. The extension would have the same eaves and height as the host dwelling and accordingly, would not be subservient in appearance. Moreover, the proposal would introduce a double gable feature on the rear elevation of the new roof with glazed gable ends which, in my view, would be highly dominant and would overwhelm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.
8. The proposed would also result in two long unrelieved flank walls. Whilst the roof would be hipped, the depth of the proposed extension together with its roof form, accentuated by its flat crown roof section, would represent a bulky and incongruous addition to the dwelling which would be harmful to its original character and appearance.
9. I appreciate that the rear elevation would only be visible from adjoining rear gardens and would not be visible in the public realm. However, views of the long flank elevations and the bulky crown roof structure would be obtainable from Warren Road, particularly through the gap between the appeal property and the steep side catslide roof of No 16. Whilst there are properties in Warren Road with crown roof sections including the highlighted examples at Nos 25 and 48 Warren Road, in my view, the appeal proposal would combine deep flank elevations with a relatively large flat roof crown section, which would be at odds with the steeply hipped roof form of No 16 and the modest pitched roof of No 12 and in this regard would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
10. I acknowledge the appellant's desire to balance the appearance of dwelling however, I have found that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area.
11. Thus, the proposal would conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2023). These policies, amongst other matters, seek to ensure developments are of a high quality design which respects the design of the original property and surrounding area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR