



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 September 2021

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3279666

1 Rodney Gardens, Eastcote HA5 2RS

- 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 & Mrs James and Nicola Hawkes against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 76353/APP/2021/1486, dated 14 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is Renovation of existing dwelling, alterations to existing fenestration, rear extension, mezzanine floor and associated garden/landscaping works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the time the appeal was submitted, the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published in July 2021. My decision is made in the context of the revised Framework.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether or not the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Eastcote Park Estate Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal property forms part of the Eastcote Park Estate Conservation Area. Its significance derives from its 1930's planned layout intended as an area of affordable houses for London workers. The surrounding locality consists of a variety of residential houses of differing design and types within a landscaped setting. The gaps between houses results in a spacious feel to the local area and are a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.
5. The appeal dwelling is a chalet style bungalow that shares significant symmetry with the adjacent dwelling of Number 3 Rodney Gardens. Given it is a chalet style dwelling, the roof formation is an intrinsic part of the character. It is also apparent that there are a number of other similarly designed chalet bungalows within close range of the appeal site.
6. The proposed rear extension would add significant mass and bulk to the host dwelling. This would be further compounded by the minimal set down of the proposed roof in relation to the main roof and the set in from either side of the

- original flank walls. The splayed form to one side would not be in character with the very defined square edges of the original walls of the dwelling.
7. Although clay roof tiles are a recognisable feature of the chalet dwelling here, and may be seen elsewhere in the local area, the continuous palette of materials to both flank walls that would extend to the ground level, would further draw the eye and emphasize its discordant appearance. This would be taken together with the disjointed eaves line as a combination of negative factors.
 8. The large window proposed to be set flush within the new roof and at high level, would not align with the existing dormer window or that of the new flush fitting roof light proposed to the west elevation. It would appear at odds with the fenestration pattern that is a unique characteristic of the host dwelling.
 9. It would be clearly visible from the street scene, in particular due to the low level garages that presently allow public views into the site from Rodney Gardens. Furthermore, it would be seen in gaps between houses along Cheney Street. From this vantage, not only would its uncharacteristic scale be apparent, the extent of louvered panels that would be visible would harmfully jar with the traditional pallet of materials seen locally.
 10. Whilst I note the letter of support, it would not lead me to reach an alternative view; the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.
 11. I appreciate the intentions of the appellants to provide a more energy efficient and flexible home for their family, the additional light levels into the dwelling it would bring, as well as the Covid-19 pandemic circumstances. However, that is not to say that an alternative scheme that meets their requirements cannot be achieved. Whilst it may not lead to harm arising to the living conditions of neighbouring occupants, an absence of harm in this respect neither weighs for nor against the proposal.
 12. With reference to the Framework and proposals affecting heritage assets, in finding harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, the magnitude of that harm should be assessed. Given that the impact of the proposal would be limited to the character and appearance of the CA, I find that the harm would be 'less than substantial' in this instance.
 13. Under such circumstances, Paragraph 202 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. A public benefit to the scheme is that the house, that is currently in a neglected condition, would be brought back into use. However, that is not to say that this could not be achieved without this scheme being secured.
 14. In the words of the Framework, any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial weight is attached to harm, and subsequently the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development does not exist. In addition, the scheme would conflict with the design and heritage aims of Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies 2012, and those of Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies January 2020. Finally,

it would not meet the objectives of Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021 and the Framework in their combined aims to protect the historic environment.

Other Matters

15. The appellants may be of the view that an amended proposal would be less satisfactory, however the merits of such are not before me to comment upon. Any complaints regarding the service they have received from the Council should be directed to them in the first instance.

Conclusion

16. The proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. It would thus lead to conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR