

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2021

by David Fitzsimon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3265644
13 Attlee Road, Hayes , Middlesex UB4 9JB

- 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 Shahid Rashid against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 69948/APP/2020/2716, dated 27 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is 'porch in front of the side extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The porch was present at the time of my visit. This has no bearing on my decision which is based on the merits of the case.
3. The Council's Delegated Report indicates that the two storey extension at the appeal property has not been built in accordance with the plans pursuant to planning permission Ref. 69948/APP/2014/4398. The Report suggests the differences include a lean-to roof rather than a flat roof to the single storey side section of the extension, a wrap around section linking to a rear extension and alterations to the side fenestration. However, the planning application which is the subject of the appeal before me relates to the porch only. My assessment is therefore limited solely to that element.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development undertaken on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits.

Reasons

5. The appeal relates to a semi-detached dwelling which sits within a predominantly residential area that is home to a variety of building sizes and styles. It is located within the Barnhill Estate Area of Special Local Character (BEASLC), which is a non-designated local heritage asset. The BEASLC Statement explains that although there have been alterations to some of the
-

original features within the Estate, the majority of houses have not had large or inappropriate extensions.

6. The approved two storey side extension was to be set back from the main front elevation of the host dwelling, with the ground floor section being wider than the first floor. The development which is the subject of this appeal is effectively a single storey element which has been added to the front of the constructed two storey extension, sitting flush with the main front elevation of the host dwelling. It has a window and door to the front elevation along with an open lean-to canopy which is supported by a decorative pillar.
7. The main body of the appeal dwelling also has a lean-to canopy running along the width of its original frontage, supported by a similar decorative pillar. Whilst the development undertaken effectively extends this canopy across the full width of the earlier addition, it does not continue at precisely the same height and profile. As such, it appears as something of a disjointed addition.
8. I acknowledge that if the development before was not in place, the appeal dwelling and the other half of this pair of semi-detached dwellings, No. 11 Attlee Road, would not be entirely symmetrical because of the two storey addition. However, the approved extension was to be set back from the main front elevation of the host dwelling in order to ensure a degree of subservience. In my view, the level of subservience is markedly reduced because of the porch sitting flush with the main front elevation. Furthermore, the introduction of a second front door gives the side extension the appearance of a separate dwelling. This only adds to its incongruous appearance and further imbalances this pair of semi-detached dwellings. The harmful visual effect is readily visible from the public domain and it impacts negatively on the overall character and appearance of the street scene.
9. It is accepted that the development undertaken does not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby properties, but this is a neutral factor in the overall planning balance. I am also mindful of the fact that a variety of porches have been added to dwellings within the local area. I do not know the precise planning circumstances behind the examples highlighted, but none are directly comparable to the development before me, which I have considered on its individual merits in any event.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development undertaken unacceptably harms the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits. In such terms, it conflicts with policies DMHB1, DMHB5, DMHB11 and DMHB12 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 – Development Management Policies, which collectively promote high quality design that harmonises with local context.
11. The arguments advanced by the Appellant do not outweigh this harm and policy conflict therefore the appeal does not succeed.

David Fitzsimon

INSPECTOR