



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2022

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3293144

4 St. Catherines Road, RUISLIP, HA4 7RU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Paul Reynolds against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 21875/APP/2021/4373, dated 29 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2022.
 - The application sought planning permission for the erection of a 2-storey side and rear extension without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref 21875/APP/2021/1603, dated 16 June 2021.
 - The condition in dispute is No 3 which states that: The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building and shall thereafter be retained as such.
 - The reason given for the condition is: To safeguard the visual amenities of the area and to ensure that the proposed development does not have an adverse effect upon the appearance of the existing building in accordance with Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect that varying the condition to retain the materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the appeal scheme would have on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. I saw at the site visit that the extension has already been constructed using materials that do not match those of the existing building at the time that planning permission was granted. The effect of the variation requested is to allow the existing materials to be used.
4. The area around the appeal site is typically suburban in character and appearance, individual detached properties present subtle variations in design while maintaining a degree of conformity. The appeal property occupies a prominent corner plot and as a result of the earlier planning consent, is larger than many of the neighbouring properties. As such the appeal site and property is a visible and prominent feature in the local area.

5. Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) (the LP) with regards design requires that, amongst other matters, alterations and extensions shall be of matching materials to the original house and not have an adverse impact on the street or wider area.
6. The National Planning Policy Framework, referred to by the appellant, supports good design, advises that decision makers should refuse development which is not well designed, gives significant weight to development which reflects local design policies and details that development should not be materially diminished through changes to "approved details such as materials used"¹.
7. I saw at the site visit that the very dark grey/black weather boarding is extensively used on the external surfaces of the appeal property, dominating the elevations when seen from the public highway. The effect is to wrap the appeal property in a dark shroud creating a stark and jarring contrast to the red roof tiles and brick of the appeal property and the other residential properties in the local area.
8. The appellant has referred to a number of examples of the use of a similar material elsewhere in the local area. Those examples provided by the appellant and those that I saw in the local area used the materials sparingly and limited to specific elements of buildings, in contrast to the dominating use of the material at the appeal property.
9. I note that the area is not identified as a designated or non-designated heritage asset. Nonetheless, the materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the appeal scheme are an alien and incongruous feature in the local area resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policy DMHB 11 of the LP.

Other Matters

10. I note that the appeal site is in an accessible location, with access to services and facilities. This does not however outweigh the harm I have identified previously.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mr M Brooker

INSPECTOR

¹ National Planning Policy Framework - paragraph 135