



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2019

by M Chalk BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3233065

9 Blaydon Close, Ruislip HA4 8AD

- 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 Kraig Morbey against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 74737/APP/2019/1177, dated 5 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey front extension following demolition of existing porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Construction work was taking place at the property at the time of my site visit, with scaffolding and scaffold sheeting erected around the house. However, the front of the house was visible and therefore I was able to make an appropriate assessment of the proposed development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the property and wider area.

Reasons

4. The property is a bungalow located on a residential cul-de-sac. Blaydon Close is characterised mainly by bungalows on the odd numbered side, and two-storey houses on the even numbered side, although 12 Blaydon Close is a bungalow. Nos 3, 5, 7 and 9 are bungalows of generally similar character, although not identical.
5. The appeal property has a staggered front elevation with a front projection, porch and window set back increasing distances from the road. This is in common with nos 5 and 7, while no 3 has a front projection but no porch. 5 Blaydon Close has a lightweight canopy enclosing part of the recessed area, but this is open-fronted and of limited visual impact in the street scene.
6. The proposed development would bring the recessed front elevation significantly forward so that only a small recess would remain from the foremost projection.

7. The proposal would also introduce a crown roof element to the front of the house. This would fail to integrate successfully with the existing roofscape of the property. As the existing property is a bungalow, the roofscape is brought directly into general view. The proposed development would be a prominent feature of the street scene, especially as the existing house is set further forward on its plot than the neighbour at 7 Blaydon Close.
8. The depth, prominence and failure to successfully integrate with the existing roofscape of the house means that the proposed development would be out of keeping with the character of the appeal property. The proposed development would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the property and the wider area. It would be contrary to policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (Adopted November 2012), saved policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan 1998 (saved September 2007) and guidance in the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions (December 2008). Together these seek to ensure that residential extensions are of a high quality of design which enhances the local distinctiveness of the area and harmonises with the existing street scene.

Other matters

9. The appellant has referred to the possibility of constructing a flat-roofed porch under the property's Permitted Development rights. An application for a Certificate of Lawfulness has been submitted to the Council to establish this as a fallback position. However, I have not been provided with plans of this proposal so cannot attach significant weight to it in determining this appeal. In any case, each appeal must be determined on its own merits, which I have done here.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR