
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 December 2022

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3304861

54 Elthorne Road, Hillingdon, Uxbridge UB8 2PS

- 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 & Miss A Li against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 20866/APP/2022/1009, dated 25 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is erect replacement of existing side and rear conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposal has altered from the application form to the decision notice. That on the application form adequately describes the proposal and I have considered it on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Greenway Conservation Area (the Conservation Area).

Reasons

4. This part of the Conservation Area comprises largely of well-established residential buildings in brick with some use of render finishes, of established and attractive appearance. The form, scale, materials and detailing of these buildings are defining features of its character and appearance.
5. The host dwelling makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Although accepting that there are some mixed materials within the existing conservatory, it does incorporate a degree of timber into its construction. The framing is of slender proportion and the narrow and tall openings afford the existing structure a vertical emphasis that is reflective of the window openings on the host dwelling.
6. These positive aspects would not be replicated within the replacement conservatory, which would use upvc material that appears to be thicker framed, with less openings which would not offer the same vertical emphasis.
7. The materials and design would subsequently detract from the appearance of the property. The proposal would detract from the heritage significance of the

Conservation Area which lies in part with the form, scale, materials and detailing of the buildings.

8. Although the views of the conservatory are generally limited to the western private section of Norton Road, nonetheless, the replacement conservatory would be visible to any users of this road through the existing open railed gate.
9. The harm to the significance of the Conservation Area would be less than substantial. Paragraph 196 of the Framework¹ requires such harm to be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal.
10. There would be public benefits associated with the proposal. These would include improved living space at the appeal property. However, the benefit of improved space would primarily be a personal one for the occupant/s of the dwelling. It is also likely that the energy efficiency of the replacement conservatory would be improved over that existing. However, given the scale of the scheme such benefit within the wider context would be very limited.
11. Given the degree of harm I have found that would arise from the appeal scheme and the statutory protection afforded to Conservation Areas, such benefit is not sufficient to outweigh this harm.
12. The proposal would subsequently conflict with policies BE 1 and HE 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 Strategic Policies (2012), policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4 and DMHB 11 of the Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) and Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2021). Amongst other things, these policies require high quality design which avoids harm to the historic environment.

Other Matters

13. My attention has been drawn to permissions locally where upvc has been incorporated. However, the examples in the main appear to relate to rear additions which are far less likely to have visibility to the public within the local area. I therefore afford these examples limited weight.
14. I also note the use of upvc within window openings in the local area. The example drawn to my attention relates to a block of flats locally. However, this building could be considered neutral in terms of its contribution to the Conservation Area and I therefore afford this matter limited weight.

Conclusion

15. There is nothing to indicate that the decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with the development plan and I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

TJ Burnham

INSPECTOR

¹ National Planning Policy Framework 2021.