



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 24 November 2020

by R E Jones BSc (Hons), DipTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st December 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3255876

30 West Drayton Park Avenue, West Drayton UB7 7QA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant [outline] planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Vladimiras Sadzevicius against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 65695/APP/2020/962, dated 19 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is part single storey, part double storey rear extension, demolition of existing and erection of new garage, enclosure to porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether or not the proposed enclosure to the porch would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the West Drayton Green Conservation Area (WDGCA).

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwelling located in the WDGCA. I have therefore attached considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area (CA) in accordance with section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
4. No 30 is half of a largely symmetrical pair of semi-detached dwellings both incorporating double height bay windows with a gable roof supported by wooden brackets above. Each dwelling also has a catslide roof that partially covers a brick porch area with an open frontage supported by pillars. Although the central pillar and trellis has been removed from No 30, the recessed porch nevertheless retains a strong symmetrical relationship with that of the adjoining semi (No 32).
5. In the wider context, the WDGCA's special character is derived from the original 1930s era detached and semi-detached dwellings. Dwellings are primarily uniform in terms of their scale and set back position from the road, while they incorporate refined and well thought architectural detailing such as bay windows, timbered gables, port hole windows, brick chimney stacks and open front porches. Although some dwellings have been altered, the original architectural details are still largely evident on the houses in the conservation

- area, particularly at No 30, and accordingly the appeal dwelling makes a positive contribution to the significance of the heritage asset.
6. The proposed porch enclosure would result in new cladding to its front and side elevation that would be marginally recessed. Despite the cladding being set back somewhat it would nevertheless result in the porch having an altogether more solid and bulky appearance in contrast to its current open arrangement. This would have a discordant presence on the dwelling and result in the loss of an original architectural feature that would in part fail to preserve one of the special qualities of the WDGCA. Moreover, the proposed porch would have an unbalancing effect on the neighbouring porch at No 32, that would fail to maintain the architectural composition of the pair. This would have a harmful visual effect that would be particularly noticeable from the street.
 7. It is acknowledged that the central pillar and wooden trellis incorporated into the proposal's design would match similar original features on the adjoining dwelling at No 32. Yet, their appearance and prominence would be diminished as elsewhere on the street these architectural features are seen in context with the open and recessed front porches that form part of the WDGCA's special character.
 8. In support of the appeal, my attention has been drawn to other properties on the street that have modified and adapted their original front porches to the extent that their open and symmetrical appearance has been lost. However, I do not know the full circumstances of those cases or the policies that applied at the time of their consideration. In any event, these do not outweigh the harm I have identified while also reinforcing the need to prevent the further erosion of many of the original architectural features of the dwellings on the street. Accordingly, these did not represent a justified comparison with the appeal proposal.
 9. The harm I have identified in relation to the proposed porch enclosure is less than substantial in terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Accordingly, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. However, the proposed development would not add to the supply of housing in the area and although it may make a small contribution to the local economy in terms of the construction process, there are no public benefits that would outweigh the harm. The porch enclosure is part of wider works at the property which would likely provide more accommodation to cater for the needs of the occupiers. However, this is a private benefit and therefore not a matter that can be weighed against the harm to the WDGCA.
 10. Overall, the proposed porch enclosure would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the WDGCA. It would also be contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Local Plan Part 1¹, Policies DMHB1, DMHB2, DMHB4, DMHB11 and DMHB12 of the Local Plan Part 2², and Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2016). These policies, amongst other considerations, require development to be sympathetic to the style of the building and character of the area, and to conserve and enhance the significance of the borough's heritage assets. The proposal would also be contrary to the Framework which requires heritage assets to be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.

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

² Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies (adopted January 2020)

Other Matters

11. As there is no dispute between the parties on the other aspects of the proposed scheme, I have considered issuing a split decision in respect of those elements that are considered acceptable. However, the proposed porch enclosure would have functional and physical implications on the internal arrangements relating to those other aspects of the scheme, such that they would not be severable from the porch enclosure. Therefore, I cannot issue a split decision.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

RE Jones

INSPECTOR