
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 June 2021

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3271945
34 Church Road, West Drayton UB7 7PX

- 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 M Lakhenpal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 30244/APP/2020/4041, dated 4 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a 2 storey rear infill extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the appeal application was determined the new London Plan has been adopted and previous Policy 7.8 has been replaced by Policy HC1. A copy of the updated policy has been provided by the Council but it does not raise new matters in the determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

3. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the host property.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling located within a primarily residential area which is also part of the Drayton Green Village Conservation Area. There is a statutory duty to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Conservation Areas and this duty is echoed in Policy HE 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies, Policies DMHB 1 and DMHB 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies (both referred to as HLP) and Policy HC1 of the London Plan (LP).
5. From the observations made, the character of the Conservation Area derives principally from The Green and the properties which front this open space; Drayton Hall and its grounds, and other areas of open land. Within the Conservation Area there is a wide range of dwelling types and sizes with no consistency of design or choice of materials.
6. The proposed development includes a 2-storey extension to the rear of the property. By reason of siting and the variations in the size, design and

external materials of dwellings, the resulting property would have a neutral effect on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and, as such, the area would be preserved. There would not be a conflict with the heritage requirements of HLP Policy HE 1, DMHB 1 and LP Policy HC1.

7. However, cumulatively with the existing 2-storey rear addition, the size of the appeal scheme would not respect the design of the original house in terms of scale, proportions and roof form. The proposed development would significantly increase the size of the host property and cumulatively the overall scale of the existing and proposed rear extensions would not represent a subservient addition. The depth and size of the proposed extension would be seen from adjacent gardens and also from the road through the gaps between the property and No. 32.
8. Although there are some examples of similar roof forms, the proposed crown roof would not harmonise with the predominance of gabled and hipped roofs within the surrounding area and would accentuate the bulk of the resulting dwelling. Although the proposed crown roof alone is not a reason for this appeal to fail, it adds to the unacceptable harm which has been identified.
9. For the reasons given, it is concluded that proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the host property and, as such, there would be a conflict with design requirements of HLP Policies BE 1 and DMHB 11 which require alterations to buildings to be of the highest standards, incorporate good design and harmonise with local context. HLP Policy DMHB 12 specifically concerns matters related to the public realm and is not of direct relevance to the alteration of dwellings. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR