

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2019

**by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 17 December 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3235061**

**18 Francis Road, Eastcote HA5 2ST**

- 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 & Mrs R Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref 26700/APP/2019/1740, dated 23 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 July 2019.
  - The development proposed is two and single storey front and rear extensions.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey and single storey front and rear extensions at 18 Francis Road, Eastcote HA5 2ST in accordance with the application, 26700/APP/2019/1740, dated 23 May 2019, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Roof Plans Drawing No SP/18/102 Rev D; Proposed Plans and Elevations for 4.0m Plan Drawing No SP/18/104 Rev B; Site Location Plan and Block/Site Plan.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

### Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr & Mrs R Patel against the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling located within a residential area. The property is L shaped with an ornate two storey forward gable feature. The property features a catslide roof creating an entrance canopy. This is set back

from the front wall of the gable. The property, to the rear, is simpler in appearance and benefits from a single storey rear extension and timber store that extends across the entire width of the property.

5. Dwellings in the area are predominantly individual and vary in terms of design and size. Having said that, the host property and No 20 Francis Road have a similar design and form. No 20 has been extended to the front and to the rear in the form of a part single storey and part two storey extension.
6. The front extension would extend the catslide roof across part of the front elevation incorporating an open porch. The design and form of the development would be similar to the one next door at No 20 and would rebalance the appearance of the two properties. The front extension would fit in well with the design of the host property and would remain a subservient feature that would not draw the eye. As such the front extension would be in keeping with the character of the host property and would not harm the character or appearance of the area.
7. The rear extension would be proportionate to the size of the host property and would not be overly dominant or intrusive. The extension would reflect the simpler form of the rear of the property and represents a subservient addition through its size, the roof design and lower ridge line. As such the rear extension would not unduly harm the character and appearance of the host property and character or appearance of the area.
8. The development therefore accords with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan - Saved Policies (2007) supported by Supplementary Planning Document 'Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement – Residential Extensions' (2008) which requires new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment, harmonise with the street scene and the scale, form, architecture and proportions of the original property.

### **Conditions**

9. I have considered the imposition of conditions in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. A condition requiring matching materials is necessary in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

### **Conclusion**

10. For the reasons set out above the appeal is allowed.

*B Thandi*

INSPECTOR