



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 June 2021

by Jonathon Parsons MSc BSc(Hons) DipTP Cert(Urb) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3270033

7 Cordingley Road, Ruislip HA4 7HH

- 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 Harry & Mrs Danielle Silver against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 55533/APP/2020/3387, dated 20 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two storey front extension (fronting Cordingley Road), front covered canopy and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. As part of the proposal, there would also be a covered canopy over the front entrance adjacent to the proposed two storey extension. The description of the proposal has been corrected accordingly.
3. The Council has raised no objections to the single storey rear extension and front covered canopy. Based on their small extent and discrete siting, this extension and canopy would be in keeping with the host dwelling and the character and appearance of the area. For similar reasons, they would not significantly affect the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties. Accordingly, the decision will focus on the two storey extension part of the proposal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the two storey extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site comprises an end of terrace dwelling. Its frontage faces onto Cordingley Road whereas the adjoining terraced frontages face onto a roughly, hard surfaced area, used for vehicular parking, and a landscaped open space adjacent to Lysander Road. The host dwelling is constructed of red brick and concrete roof tile, and has a plain simple design lacking any significant architectural features.

6. Opposite the appeal dwelling on the other side of the Cordingley Road, there are terraced dwellings which are constructed with white facing render/paint, slate roof tiles and on many, single storey frontage bays and roof gables above. On the appeal dwelling's side of the road, more recent terraced dwellings have single storey frontage projections and are constructed with a mix of red brick/white render/paint and concrete roof tiles. Although varied, the area has an attractive character and appearance.
7. The proposed two storey extension would be sited between the host dwelling and Cordingley Road. It would be at a corner location separated by garden from the adjacent dwellings on Cordingley Road. It would be stepped back from the road by approximately 3m and would be set down approximately 1m from the adjacent footway and carriageway of Cordingley Road.
8. However, it's two storey extent, including gable above, would appear dominant and bulky in a street where frontage extensions are more subservient in size and proportions. Its forward projection would roughly align with those along the street but they are of smaller and more subservient scale. Similarly, the dwellings opposite have similarly smaller scale forward projections. In contrast, the two storey extension would be overly dominant given its width and height.
9. For all these reasons, the frontage extended dwelling would be unduly prominent and disharmonious failing to integrate into the surrounding area. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (LP1) 2012 and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (LP2) 2020.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area in conflict with policies of the LP1 and LP2, and the development plan taken as a whole. There are no considerations of sufficient weight or importance that determine that the decision should be taken other than in accordance with the development plan and therefore, planning permission should be refused.
11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathon Parsons

INSPECTOR