



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2020

by Mrs H Nicholls MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3242368

24 Coteford Close, Eastcote HA5 2JA

- 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 Payne against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 66595/APP/2019/1994, dated 12 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is part single/part two storey side extension and porch to front with alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to part single/part two storey side extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the porch extension to the front at 24 Coteford Close, Eastcote, HA5 2JA, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 66595/APP/2019/1994, dated 12 June 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not 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: Site location plan, block plan and plan Ref 01.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the porch extension hereby permitted shall be constructed in materials to match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. On 16 January 2020 the Council adopted the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (LPP2) and this replaces the former Local Plan: Part Two (2012). The Council referred to the emerging policies in its decision notice and both parties have been provided with an opportunity to comment on the updated policy context in relation to the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal building is an end-of-terrace, two storey dwelling constructed from red brick. It is one of approximately six dwellings of the same style which sit at either ends of short terraces and which all have a two storey projection to the

- front. Otherwise, dwellings in the surrounding area are a variety of two storey and dormer-style dwellings in a close arrangement around a cul-de-sac estate road.
5. The appeal proposal would introduce a two storey extension to the side of the dwelling alongside the existing front projection, infilling the leftover gap.
 6. The two storey side extension would not exceed more than half of the width of the existing dwelling. In this regard, it would technically comply with newly adopted Policy DMHD1 of LPP2. Despite this, it would appear large in relation to the front two storey projecting feature of the existing dwelling, undermining its prominence and the detracting from the cohesion of the street scene.
 7. In terms of the set down from the ridgeline of the host dwelling, there are no specific requirements in Policy DMHD1. The preamble to the Policy sets out that roofs of side extensions should be set back from the front roof plane so that their ridges are lower than the main ridge to ensure that the addition reads as a subordinate element. The proposal would have a crown roof that would be marginally set down from the main ridge. In this sense, it would be identifiable as a later addition to the dwelling.
 8. The front wall of the side extension would be flush with the front wall of the dwelling at ground floor level and would only be set back by approximately 0.5 metres from the front wall at first floor level. LPP2 Policy DMHD1 criterion C) v) requires that two storey side extensions to detached and semi-detached properties should be set back a minimum of 1 metre behind the main front elevation. This aspect of the policy seeks to ensure that there is a definition between the existing dwelling and any new side extension. The appeal proposal would fail to achieve this minimum set back and this would undermine the ability to read the extension as a subordinate element. The proposal would therefore technically breach this criterion of Policy DMHD1.
 9. Whilst the amount by which the Policy would be breached is relatively marginal, the proposal would not appear clearly distinct from the original dwellinghouse and there are no considerations which suggest that a decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with the newly adopted Policy.
 10. In view of this main issue, the two storey side extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. It would therefore fail to comply with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One¹ and LPP2 Policies DMHD1 and DMHD11. When read together, these policies seek to ensure that extensions are designed to the highest standards and appear subordinate to in terms of their floor area, width, depth and height.
 11. The proposal would also fail to adhere to guidance in the Residential Extensions (HDAS) SPD² which sets out the detailed considerations in relation to two storey side extensions in terms of effects on the character and quality of the overall street scene.

¹ Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (November 2012)

² Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (December 2008)

Other Matters

12. A porch extension would also be added to the front elevation, setting the front door forward from its current recessed position beneath an archway. The porch would be modest in scale and acceptable in terms of its siting, massing and design. I therefore find no harm in respect of this element of the proposal and I note the Council raised no objection in this regard either. As the proposed side and porch extensions are both physically and functionally severable, I consider a split decision would be a logical outcome.
13. I note the appellant's concern that there were delays with the registration and processing of the appeal application and that the Council did not engage prior to refusing the application. Notwithstanding this, I have considered the scheme before me on its own merits, and my findings in relation to the main issue are therefore unaffected by the suggested lack of dialogue between the parties.

Conclusion and conditions

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed in relation to the porch extension. However, in relation to the part single/part two storey side extension the appeal should be dismissed.
15. In respect of the porch element, in addition to the statutory time limit condition, it is necessary to impose a condition specifying the approved plans in the interests of certainty. In order to maintain the character and appearance of the area, it is also necessary to condition the requirement to construct the porch from materials to match the host dwelling.

Hollie Nicholls

INSPECTOR