



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2025

by B J Sims BSc (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/25/3359423

27B Church Road, Hillingdon, UB8 3NB.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr G Bourton against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon Council.
- The application Ref is 2202/APP/2024/2331.
- The development proposed is the erection of a single-storey part rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single-storey part rear extension at 27B Church Road, Hillingdon, UB8 3NB, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2202/APP/2024/2331, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out only in accordance with the approved plans Refs A101-106 and NP-01-2, received 02-09-2024.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects the proposed extension would have on the character and appearance of the existing house and the surrounding Cowley Church (St Lawrence) Conservation Area, and on the settings of Listed Buildings in the vicinity.

Reasons

Character and Appearance, Conservation Area, Listed Buildings

3. Notwithstanding its description as a part single-storey rear extension, the proposed new construction would extend across the full width of the original building. However, having initially been a Coach House serving the built group that includes the Listed No 27C Church Road adjacent, the appeal building has historically been extended on both sides to provide additional ground floor sleeping and kitchen accommodation, so that in effect the extension covers only about half the present rear ground-floor elevation.

4. With a depth of 4m and a maximum height of 3.4m the extension would conform to the dimensional requirements of Policy DMHD1 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan (HLP). The roof profile would closely reflect that of the existing main construction, and the finishing materials and fenestration, when secured by condition, would match or complement those of the present elevations.
5. I therefore do not accept the assertions of the Council and local objectors that the proposed extension would be oversized and insubordinate in relation to its host. This judgement is borne out by the generous extent of the rear garden, within which the extension would stand.
6. The extension would barely be visible from the surrounding area, save from the rear of properties including Nos 27A and 25 Church Road. In relation to the adjacent Listed Building at No 27C, I am thus satisfied that the proposed development would have no harmful impact upon its setting, nor on the integrity of the historic group of which they form part, wherein the appeal building would remain visibly subordinate, in my view.
7. Also, with respect to the wider surrounding area, I find that the development would have no harmful effect on the setting of the Church or any other building, and would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area as a whole, in accordance with long-established planning law and current local and national planning policy.

Further Material Considerations

8. I do not reach my foregoing findings lightly, and I am acutely aware of the large volume of objection by local residents who are concerned that the architectural and social integrity of their community should not be eroded.
9. I have therefore carefully considered every matter raised, including the effects on residential amenity, the local highway network, trees, and drainage.
10. However, in connection with these matters I have found no evidence to question the findings of the Council. In summary, these are:
 - i. Residential Amenity: due to the single-storey nature of the extension and its separation distance from neighbouring properties, the development would not cause harmful loss of light, privacy or outlook at any neighbouring property; and there would be a sufficient private external space retained to comply with Table 5.3 of Policy DMHB 18 of the HLP.
 - ii. Parking and Highway Safety: there would be no increase in occupation such that no additional parking space would be needed, and no physical impact on the existing three frontage parking spaces. The proposed development would therefore be in accordance with Policy DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the HLP.
 - iii. Trees and Landscaping: due to its separation distance from trees within and surrounding the site, the proposed extension would have no adverse tree-related impact.
 - iv. Drainage and Flood Risk: the site is not in an area prone to flooding nor in a critical drainage area; the drainage implications of the development would

be limited and acceptable, being also subject to separate building control regarding sewer connections.

Other Matters

11. Other matters are raised including profit motivation, potential use as a HMO¹, construction noise, and structural integrity.
12. Again, I agree with the position of the Council, that the intentions of the developer behind the application are not material to planning, and that the proposal is for a single-storey domestic extension, not a HMO, and is to be assessed as such. Construction noise and impacts are temporary and subject to environmental protection legislation. Issues regarding the structural integrity are for separate building control procedures.

Conclusions

13. Accordingly, the outcome of this appeal turns solely upon the first issues of character and appearance within the Conservation Area, and the setting of the Listed Building at 27C Church Road.
14. For the reasons given above, I consider that the proposed extension would comply with the provisions of Policies BE1 and DMHB11-12 of the HLP, as well as D3-4 of the London Plan, regarding the form, character and design quality of built development and its integration into its local context. These policies are essentially consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). With respect to the protection of heritage assets, I find that the proposal is also compliant with Policies HE1, DMHB1 and DMHB4 of the HLP as well as HC1 of the London Plan, which are also consistent with the NPPF.
15. I conclude overall that the proposed development would be in compliance with the development plan as a whole and that therefore this appeal should be allowed and the planning permission sought granted, subject only to the standard conditions set out above.

B J Sims

INSPECTOR

¹ House in Multiple Occupation