



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 May 2022

by S A Hanson BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/C/20/3263231

11 Woodgate Crescent, Northwood, HA6 3RB

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended. The appeal is made by Mr Naboth Gaza against an enforcement notice issued by London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The notice, numbered HS/ENF/017290(A), was issued on 16 October 2020.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is: Without planning permission the erection of a front porch.
 - The requirements of the notice are to: (i) Remove the front porch (as shown in the approximate position hatched in blue on the attached plan); and (ii) Remove from the land all debris, waste, building materials, fixtures and fittings, plant equipment and machinery resulting from the remedial work listed above.
OR
(iii) Alter the front porch (as shown in the approximate position hatched in blue on the attached plan) to be in accordance with the details in proposed plans ref: Proposed Left Side Elevation 1106/1/5, Proposed Front Elevation 1106/1/7. Proposed Ground Floor Plan 1106/1/8 and Proposed Roof Plan 1106/1/13 that were submitted under Planning Application Reference 61044/APP/2015/1545; and (iv) Remove from the land all debris, waste, building materials, fixtures and fittings, plant equipment and machinery resulting from the remedial work listed above
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended (the 1990 Act). Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed, the enforcement notice is upheld and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

Preliminary Matters

2. The notice refers to the development conflicting with certain policies from the London Plan 2016. However, in 2021 a new version of the London Plan was published. I asked the appeal parties to comment on the implications of this change to the development plan. I have not received any responses and therefore I will determine the deemed planning application having regard to the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020).

The appeal on ground (a) and the deemed planning application

Main Issue

3. This is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property having regard to the site's location in the Gatehill Farm Estate, Northwood - Area of Special Local Character (ASLC).

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a red brick, two-storey dwellinghouse under a red/brown clay tile roof that has recently been extended pursuant to planning permission granted on 1 July 2015¹. The house is situated on the north side of Woodgate Crescent within the Gatehill Farm Estate which is designated as an Area of Special Local Character (ASLC). The ASLC is a non-designated local heritage asset that has a character and identity which local residents value and the council wishes to preserve or enhance. The property frontage is mainly hardsurfaced to provide parking and has areas of soft landscaping. A low boundary wall divides the area from the adjoining highway.
5. The dwellinghouse is situated within a residential area comprising of large, detached dwellings. The properties within the immediate setting display a variety of architectural design and materials, while some retain their original traditional form, others present more contemporary detailing. This has resulted in a diverse style of development along this section of Woodgate Crescent, which is described in the Character Assessment for the Gatehill Farm Estate – Proposed Conservation Area² as being of less interest architecturally but included because it forms part of the original layout of the Gatehill Estate.
6. Notwithstanding this, the porch addition to the appeal property is a significant structure that draws the eye. This is due to the classical style pillars and protrusion of the flat roof which screens the closed internal porch constructed with red brick. The appeal development is visually dominant and contrived and viewed against the dwellinghouse, its presence interrupts the cohesive nature of the architectural style of the principal elevation of the property. Furthermore, due to the topography of the site, the porch is in an elevated position, and because of the open nature of the property frontage, the harm is accentuated. I note the display of flat roof dormers to the front elevation of the dwellinghouse, but these extend modestly and are set back in the roof slope.
7. The appellant considers that the porch is of a reduced height and width and a less dominant feature than that which was permitted by the 2015 permission. However, the design of the appeal development is in stark contrast to the dwellinghouse. Furthermore, the pastiche classical columns are an unsympathetic addition to the dwellinghouse and are highlighted by Policy DMHD 1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (January 2020) (the LPDMP) as being a feature that would not be supported in porch design.
8. The appellant has brought to my attention the use of a similar porch design using columns on two properties within the neighbourhood and I saw these

¹ LPA reference 61044/APP/2015/1545 - Part two storey, part single storey rear extension, first floor side extension incorporating front dormer, single storey infill extension to front, extension to porch and new pitch roof to front and new pitch roof over garage

² Provided by the LPA as Appendix 1

examples when I visited the site. Whilst there are design differences which omit the expanse of flat roof displayed on the appeal property, I am not aware of the full circumstances of these developments or their planning status. Nevertheless, these other developments do not justify the harm I have identified.

9. The porch by reason of its design and materials, fails to reflect the character of the area and harmonise with or respect the architectural composition of the existing dwellinghouse. The appeal development is out of proportion and visually incongruous. This is harmful to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the dwellinghouse and the wider ASLC. The development therefore conflicts with Policy DMHD 1, Policy DMHB 5 and Policy DMHB 11 of the LPDMP and guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Frameworks which promotes the importance of good design.

Other Matters

10. The appellant suggests that the porch could be reduced in size to accord with the dimensions that would be permitted under Article 3 and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class D of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended. However, even if this was a realistic prospect, there is insufficient information to determine whether or not the development before me would be less desirable than any development option that may be lawful.

Conclusion on ground (a) and the deemed planning application

11. There are no material considerations that indicate the deemed planning application should be determined other than in accordance with the Development Plan. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal on ground (a) should not succeed, and I shall refuse to grant planning permission on the deemed application.

S A Hanson

INSPECTOR