



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 March 2025 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/25/3360267

19 Highfield Drive, Hillingdon, Ickenham UB10 8AW

- 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 Dr Zain Shamoan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 76019/APP/2024/2688.
 - The development proposed is described as “erection of a part single, part double storey side/rear extension with porch canopy to front and amendment to fenestrations, following demolition of side garage; roof alterations to include raising ridge and eaves height, new crown roof with gable projection to the front and a rear dormer.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for development described as “erection of a part single, part double storey side/rear extension with porch canopy to front and amendment to fenestrations, following demolition of side garage; roof alterations to include raising ridge and eaves height, new crown roof with gable projection to the front and a rear dormer” at 19 Highfield Drive, Hillingdon, Ickenham UB10 8AW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 76019/APP/2024/2688 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not 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, references PA-02 and PA-03
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 4) The first-floor windows in the side elevations facing Numbers 17 and 21 Highfield Drive shall be fitted with obscured glass to at least 4 on the Pilkington Scale and be non-opening below a height of 1.8 metres taken from the internal finished floor level. They shall be retained as such thereafter.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of development on the decision notice and appeal form does not match the application form. However, the application form does not refer to the

porch. I therefore have used the description on the appeal form as it more accurately describes the proposal and does not fundamentally alter it. In addition, I have taken the adoption date of the London Plan to be 2021. It is referred to as such in the evidence and erroneously cited as 2020 in the reasons for refusal. This has not affected the substance of the appeal in the cases of either main party.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on a) the character and appearance of the area; and b) the living conditions of the occupiers of Number 21 (No 21) Highfield Drive with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal building is a detached two storey dwelling which has an extant planning permission for a similar scheme. This appeal scheme is similar besides the increase to the first storey rear element and changes to the front elevation. The surrounding character is primarily large, detached dwellings. Many appear to have been extended. Their designs leave little consistency to the street scene. Their set back and overall scale contributes positively to a pleasant and varied character.
6. The Council have raised no objections to the porch canopy, and I have no reason to disagree. The proposed rear projection, whilst large compared with the existing building, would harmonise with the overall design of the dwelling and would not be so significant in scale terms to result in harm. Moreover, the plot is sizable and can accommodate an extension of this scale. The design of which would not appear alien in this context. Additionally, the existing building and those around it present as large and detached and that situation would not materially change by extending the dwelling to the proposed extent.
7. The increased eaves height in combination with the roof raising would be marginal and would resultantly sit comfortably with the overall scheme, the scale of the prevailing dwellings and their varied character. The windows in both scale and shape on the front elevation would be different, but their placement the same and they would be a congruent feature of the eventual design.
8. The proposal would not therefore detrimentally change the building to result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would not be greatly different to what could already be built by virtue of the extant permission. It would thus comply with Policies D1 and D4 of the London Plan 2021 (LP), Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part One 2012 (LP Part One) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two Development Management Policies 2020 (DMP) which together seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard. Policy D1 of the LP is strategic and so has not been decisive in relation to the modest nature of the appeal scheme.

Living Conditions

9. The proposal would abut the boundary of No 21 with a small separation distance between it and the boundary treatment. It would present as a two-storey projection which would step in directly adjacent the boundary to a single storey element to further reduce its effect. It would result in some blank elevation viewed from No 21 both within the building and the garden. Its effect would however be oblique by

virtue of the stepped extension and separation distance which would result in a minimal impact to the long outwards views from the adjacent windows. Additionally, and on the ground floor, the existing boundary treatments and separation distance would lessen the effect of the proposal and would not result in an adverse sense of enclosure or be visually intrusive. Moreover, due to the long plot and spacious gardens, the garden is otherwise unincumbered in its rear aspect.

10. The scheme would not therefore harmfully affect the outlook of the occupiers of No 21. Resultantly, it would comply with Policies DMHD1 and DMHB11 of the DMP which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that the living conditions of the occupiers of properties are protected.

Conditions

11. The time limit condition and reference to the approved plans are required for enforcement purposes. It is also necessary to ensure that the materials are to match the host dwelling to be in keeping with the area. It is further reasonable and necessary to require obscure glazing to both side elevations of the building on the first floor to protect the privacy of the occupiers of Nos 17 and 21 Highfield Drive.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons set out above, the appeal scheme would comply with the development plan. I therefore recommend it be allowed, subject to the conditions set out.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted, subject to the conditions set out above.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR