



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2024

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3350081

57 Warren Road, Ickenham, Hillingdon UB10 8AD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Sukhdeep Rauli against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 16915/APP/2024/811.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part single storey and part two storey side extension and conversion of garage to habitable use.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. For clarity, although the site location plan identifies 55 Warren Road as the appeal property, the correct property was visited during the site visit.

Main issue

3. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the host property and the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an altered 2-storey detached dwelling, with accommodation within the roofspace, situated within a primarily residential area. The alterations already undertaken include a 2-storey side extension, single storey additions at the rear and a dormer window within the rear roof slope. From what could be seen from the property's rear garden, other detached dwellings fronting Warren Road have been altered by various types and designs of rear additions, these include Nos. 49 and 71 albeit the council has identified there is no planning permission for these extensions.
5. The proposed development includes the replacement of the rear additions by a full width single storey extension with, in part, a first floor extension above. The appellant has identified planning permission has been granted for the single storey rear extension (Ref 16915/APP/2024/1488). Although the proposed extensions to the rear of the property are assessed as a whole, significant weight is given to the approved extension in the determination of this appeal.

6. It would not be possible to see the proposed rear extensions to the property from Warren Road with any view confined to the gardens of the neighbouring dwellings. It is noted the council has not objected to the change to the opening associated with the proposed use of the garage as habitable accommodation. Accordingly, the appeal scheme would not harm the character and appearance the streetscene.
7. By reason of the size of the existing property and its curtilage, in particular the width and length of the rear garden, the scale of the proposed rear extensions would not represent an overdevelopment of the plot. Further, the spacious and verdant character and appearance of the rear gardens associated with the dwellings fronting Warren Road would be preserved. For the reasons given, the appeal scheme would not conflict with Policy DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (HLP2) which requires development to be well integrated with the surrounding area.
8. However, cumulatively with previous alterations, the scale and massing of the proposed rear extensions would fail to be sympathetic to the existing character and proportions of the host property as required by HLP2 Policy DMHD 1. The cumulative scale of the existing and proposed alterations would not be subordinate to the host property.
9. By reason of the proposed design there would be an awkward juxtaposition between the proposed crown roof of the first floor extension and the existing rear roofslope of the property. In reaching this judgement it is acknowledged that the property already has a crown roof albeit this is smaller in size. Further, the design of the appeal scheme would also result in an awkward juxtaposition between the ground floor extension's roof and the rear elevation of the first floor extension where Bedroom 4 would extend above the Office.
10. Overall, when assessed together with other alterations, the proposed rear extensions' design would fail to respect the architectural composition of the property which is required by HLP2 Policy DMHB 11. For the same reasons, the proposed rear extensions would not achieve a high quality of design as sought by Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (HLP1) In reaching this judgment, account has been taken of the cumulative impact of the approved scheme and the alterations already undertaken but the unacceptable harm associated with the overall scale and design of the proposed rear extension outweigh what could be erected by the appellant.
11. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and, as such, it would conflict with HLP1 Policy BE1 and HLP2 Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1. Policy D3 of the London Plan is a generic policy about optimising site capacity via a design led approach rather than specifically addressing householder applications. However, this does not alter the conclusion that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR