



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 August 2021

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3280123
77 St Georges Drive, Ickenham UB10 8HP

- 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 Przemek Jasek against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref: 12943/APP/2021/589 dated 13 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2021.
 - The development is change of materials (bricks to white render), new non-openable window, installation of roller shutters in each window, installation of PV panels in two locations, replacement of existing fence with new fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the application was determined, the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) has been revised in July 2021. However, I do not consider that the changes directly affect the appeal proposal before me, but all references are to the July 2021 version.
3. The application forms indicated that the works had been completed by the date of the application submission, although I noted at the site visit that the PV panels had not been installed.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposals, and in particular the change of materials from brick to render and the installation of roller shutters to each window, on the character and appearance of the property and the local area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached property on the west side of St George's Drive, within a predominantly residential area. Whilst I noted at my site visit that in the wider context around Ickenham, there are some examples of rendered properties, the street scene in St Georges Drive is strikingly and consistently characterised by brick-built properties with vertical tiled detailing to front gables and bays under tiled roofs. I did not see, and my attention has

- not been drawn, to any other properties with windows with integral external roller shutter blinds.
6. I have been provided with photographs of the existing property before the works were undertaken and the palette of materials appeared to match those found on adjoining properties and generally within the street. Whilst the new finishes to the appeal property have, taken on their own, been completed to a high standard, they significantly and materially alter the existing character and appearance of the property. Given the significant change in appearance with its white render, the property now appears visually obtrusive and unduly prominent in the street scene; it detracts from the coherent character and appearance of the surrounding properties.
 7. At the time of my site visit, the shutters were not down on the windows facing the street, but the Appellant has included photographs showing some of these, part down. I have no doubt that whether partly or fully down, the shutters materially and adversely affect the character and appearance of the property, by creating a harsh and incongruous appearance to the property. As a result, the property appears visually discordant and detracts from the street scene.
 8. I therefore conclude that the works undertaken, and in particular the change of materials from brick to render and the installation of roller shutters to each window, adversely affect and seriously harm the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area. This conflicts with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1 of the Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020) and Policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021) and the Framework, in particular Section 12, all of which seek for a high standard of design which respects the local context.
 9. I have sympathy with the Appellant's position and the reasons why the works were undertaken, including the objectives to improve the energy efficiency of the house. I have taken all these matters into account, but they do not outweigh the harm I have concluded to the character and appearance of the house and to the local area.
 10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations in so far as they raise relevant planning matters, the appeal is dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR