

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2023

by Andrew Dale BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21.12.2023

Appeal Ref. APP/R5510/D/23/3319811

11 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 Ryan Harding against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application ref. 63804/APP/2023/272, dated 29 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 6 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey front infill extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single-storey front infill extension at 11 Cordingley Road, Ruislip HA4 7HH in accordance with the terms of the application ref. 63804/APP/2023/272, dated 29 January 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan; 01 Existing Floor Plan and Proposed Floor Plan; 02 Proposed Front Elevation; and 03 Existing Front Elevation.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension upon the character and appearance of the dwelling, the host terrace and the local street scene.

Reasons

3. Cordingley Road is characterised by a series of short terraces of 2-storey houses. All the terraces, with a single exception, are formed of 4 houses. Those rows of 4 exhibit a strong degree of uniformity and symmetry, including across each of their ground floor frontages. Some display consistent lines of simple door hoods over the main entrances, whilst others feature distinctive bay
-

window projections. These regular and locally distinctive patterns have been altered in only a handful of places. There is a sizeable lean-to porch at no. 17 in a terrace with otherwise simple door hoods. At nos 24, 26 and 28, porches have been added next to the original front bays.

4. The Council said that the proposed infill extension would fail to read as a subordinate and visually sympathetic addition to the dwelling and would result in a loss of consistency, symmetry and rhythm in the row of terraced houses.
5. The host terrace has 3 houses, rather than 4. The front of the terrace contains lean-to style forward projections at ground floor level. There are 2 paired projections (to nos 9 and 11 and to nos 11 and 15) towards the terrace's centre which are separated by a 2 m wide gap or recess in the front elevation of no. 11. There are narrower single-width projections at each end of the terrace. However, the one at no. 15 is not as deep as its paired projection with no. 11 and has no window next to the entrance door, whilst the one at no. 9 is located largely beyond the end gable, reading more like a side extension and leaving a far wider gap between the projections in its frontage compared to the gaps in each of the front elevations of nos 11 and 15. Those latter 2 gaps, whilst of similar size, are not sufficient in number to create a readily identifiable rhythm. I find overall that the host terrace does not display the same degree of consistency, symmetry and rhythm as the other terraced blocks in this road.
6. The proposed extension would plainly be minor in size and of subservient scale, simply filling in the 2 m wide recess in the ground floor front elevation of no. 11 between its 2 existing projections. It would follow the building line and be otherwise well designed with its roof style, materials, fenestration details and built form matching the adjacent projections.
7. Infilling the gap would give the impression of a front extension reaching across the entire frontage of the dwelling. This would normally be unacceptable. However, it is a point well made by the appellant that the subject extension itself would not extend across the entire frontage as the 2 original projections already exist. It is more probable than not that they are original projections given that they have been purposely designed to straddle the common boundaries of the 2 neighbouring houses and are shown to be substantially in place on the location plan when those single-width projections at nos 9 and 15 are not. Moreover, there is no relevant planning history in the officer's report pointing to the grant of permission for subsequent front extensions to no. 11.
8. Of greater importance, in my view, is how the proposed extension would neither materially alter the overall appearance of the house, given that almost 75% of the frontage of no. 11 is already made up of projections of the same form as that proposed, nor dominate the character of the street. It would not hide any features of note. The gap serves little purpose and is marked by a pair of downpipes leading to a drain.
9. The extension would consolidate the paired lean-to projections in the centre of the terrace and have no adverse consequences for the consistency, symmetry and rhythm in this row of terraced houses, to the extent that those characteristics can be attributed to nos 9, 11 and 15. In this regard, the resulting physical change would successfully integrate into its surroundings and

compare favourably to the other frontage changes in the street that have taken place at nos 17, 24, 26 and 28.

10. I consider that the proposed extension would represent a visually appropriate solution, exhibit a high standard of design, be sufficiently complementary, sympathetic and subordinate to the parent building and host terrace and be respectful of the established street scene along Cordingley Road.
11. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the proposed extension would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling, the host terrace or the local street scene.
12. As the development would be an example of high-quality design and would maintain and improve the quality of the built environment and involve the acceptable extension and alteration of a residential property, there would be no conflict with the aims of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies 2012 and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies 2020. That latter policy, where it covers front extensions in section D), is written more flexibly than its short counterpart explanatory text in paragraph A1.13. There would also be compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as it relates to achieving well-designed places.
13. The scheme will plainly enhance the quality of life for the existing and future occupants of no. 11 by providing a ground floor WC. This consideration adds further weight in favour of the appeal scheme.
14. In addition to a condition setting a time limit for the commencement of development, a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the relevant approved drawings is necessary as this provides certainty. I have also imposed the Council's other suggested condition on materials to ensure that the development would preserve the character and appearance of the dwelling and the locality.
15. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised and the absence of objections from local residents and organisations, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

Andrew Dale

INSPECTOR