

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2017

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 24th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3161710

50 Rodney Gardens, Eastcote, Middlesex HA5 2RP

- 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 Z Nourouz against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 45146/APP/2016/2858, dated 21 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is for (1) Removal of fascia to rear elevation; (2) Alterations to single storey rear extension to form pitched roof with parapet to rear; (3) Tinting of new brickwork to match existing and (4) Retention of extension once altered.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and area having particular regard to the location of the site within the Eastcote Park Estate Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow that occupies a corner position at the junction of Rodney Gardens and Dovecot Close. It is located within a mature well-established residential area, typically characterised by detached and semi-detached dwellings set back from the road. The appeal property is one of a number of bungalows located within Rodney Gardens in the CA on similar sized plots that predominantly have brick walls, hipped roofs and a projecting front bay. No. 50 Rodney Gardens being situated on a corner plot has even more expansive grounds, which add to the open character and appearance of the street scene.
 4. The appeal property has been extended with a single storey rear extension, the external walls of which are constructed in yellow brick and it has a flat roof which incorporates an overhang at the rear with a tall fascia. The eaves of the extension are several courses of brick higher than the eaves of the original dwelling. The proposal would involve the retention of the rear extension in a modified form, including the construction of a pitched crown roof over the extension with a parapet to the rear, removal of the fascia to the rear elevation and the tinting of the brickwork to match the existing dwelling.
-

5. The design and the appearance of the proposed crown roof over the extension would however be very much at odds with the roof design of the host building and the more traditional pitched roofs of many of the buildings in this section of the CA. The proposed roof, combined with the higher eaves of the extension and the parapet at the rear, results in the extension overwhelming the form of the original dwelling. In addition, the tinting of the existing stark yellow brickwork would in my opinion fail to achieve a match with the distinctive and mottled appearance of the existing brickwork.
6. These shortcomings would be exacerbated by the extension's prominent position, which is visible from a number of public vantage points along Rodney Gardens and Dovecot Close. As such I consider that the development would result in incongruous and out-of-keeping additions that would cause unacceptable harm to the architectural integrity of the original building and the character and appearance of the area.
7. The extension is seen from a small section of the CA and consequently the extent of the harm is limited and less than substantial. Nevertheless it does have a harmful impact. In accordance with paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), that harm should be weighed against any public benefits to the proposal. It is clear that the extension brings about a number of benefits to the appellant, including the improved internal living space available, warm roof design and other insulation methods. I find though insufficient public benefit to offset the identified harm to which I attach significant weight.
8. I have considered the appellant's comments that the changes proposed in the design of the extension have been in response to the pre-application comments of the Council and the previous enforcement appeal¹ on the site. The proposed changes would not, however, overcome the adverse effects outlined above and would fail to address the concerns highlighted by the Inspector for the previous appeal regarding the impact of the extension on the original dwelling and the area including the CA. I also note the appellant's comments regarding the demolition of the extension as an alternative and its impact. This, however, is not a matter for my consideration under this appeal.
9. I have noted the other developments in the area drawn to my attention by the appellant. The existing flat roofed rear extension at No. 48 Rodney Gardens is positioned below the eaves of the original dwelling and is built in matching materials and the other extensions visible from the public open space along the Celandine Route at rear of Rodney Gardens and Dovecot Close, have different development characteristics to the appeal scheme. On the basis of the limited evidence provided I am not convinced that their circumstances are compellingly similar to those of the present appeal proposal. I therefore accord them limited weight as precedents in this case.
10. Consequently, I conclude that the development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area including the CA. The development conflicts with Policy BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies 2012 and Policies BE4, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies 2012 and Policies 7.4, 7.6, 7.8 and 7.9 of the London Plan 2016. These policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure development is of a high quality design which

¹ APP/K5510/C/15/3132698

preserves or enhances the CA and harmonises with the host building and the area. It would also not accord with the Framework that development should seek to secure a high quality of design and conserve heritage assets in an appropriate manner (paragraph 17) and take into account the desirability of making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness in conserving and enhancing the historic environment (paragraph 131).

Other matters

11. I have noted the issues raised by the appellant regarding the way in which the application was processed by the Council and the appellant's personal circumstances. However, these are not a material consideration to which I can attach significant weight in making this decision.
12. I have noted the local objections to the proposal. However, in light of my findings of harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area, there is no necessity for me to consider these matters further.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR