



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2024

**by J N Seymour BA (Hons), MSc, MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 09.04.2024**

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3332764**

**185 Eastcote Road, Ruislip, Hillingdon, HA4 8BJ**

- 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 Anandaraj Thiagarajan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 22142/APP/2023/2066, dated 12 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 6 September 2023.
- The application sought planning permission for part-retrospective application for the erection of a single storey rear and part side extension and part garage conversion to habitable use without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref 22142/APP/2022/3853 dated 3 March 2023.
- 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. Notwithstanding the details so approved in Condition 2, the Mock Tudor design on the front elevation shall be retained and maintained in situ unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 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.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwelling which has been extended following the recent granting of the original planning permission the subject of this appeal against a refusal to vary Condition 3. I noted during my site visit that all external elevations of the property had been finished in white render, rather than just the front elevation as stated in the description of development provided by the appellant. Drawing A104 shows the development included the rendering of all external elevations and the Council has commented upon the works including those to all elevations. I therefore base my decision on the works as detailed on Drawing A104.
3. Scaffolding was in place during my site visit indicating works had not yet been finished, therefore I have considered the appeal on a part-retrospective basis.

## **Main Issue**

4. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the loss of the Mock Tudor detailing to the front elevation.

## **Reasons**

5. Before the recent extensions and alterations, the dwelling featured a combination of facing materials. These included the white render and black boarding on the principal elevation which combined to create the mock Tudor design which the Council sought to retain, a brick porch and roughcast render on the side elevation.
6. The appeal site forms part of a group of eight semi-detached dwellings on the northern side of Eastcote Road that have retained the mock Tudor detailing on their principal elevations, except the appeal site as all elevations of the dwelling have now been rendered white. While white render is a widely used facing material for dwellings in the locality, it forms part of a palette of materials used in their construction, contributing to their architectural character, rather than being the sole facing material.
7. The application of the new render at the appeal property has created a stark contrast with the established character of the group of eight dwellings that were constructed with the mock Tudor detailing on the principal elevation. The plain white render on all elevations creates a bland, generic appearance that fails to respect the design and character of the original dwelling, neighbouring dwellings and the locality in general. The result is a very conspicuous unbalancing of the pair of semi-detached dwellings, which is harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene.
8. Drawing these points together, the development has failed to incorporate the principles of good design as facing materials have been applied inappropriately to create a harmfully asymmetric appearance, contrary to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies 2012 ('HLP Part One') and Policies DMDH 1 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two – Development Management Policies 2020 ('HLP Part Two'). Among other things, these policies state that new extensions and alterations should respect the design of the original house and be of matching materials, which the appeal proposal fails to achieve.

## **Other Matters**

9. The appellant stated that the appeal proposal is justified to remedy damp and structural issues. However, there is no evidence before me to suggest that these issues could not be addressed whilst also retaining the mock Tudor design originally found on the principal elevation of the dwelling.
10. The appellant has referred to another appeal in the London Borough of Hillingdon which involved applying white render to a dwelling. The details provided by the appellant show it is not directly comparable to this appeal because it involves a detached dwelling in a different site context.
11. Policy HE1 of the HLP Part One is cited in the Council's reason for refusal. This is a heritage policy that is not determinative in my decision because the Council

confirmed in paragraph 3.1 of its delegated report that there are no heritage constraints on or near the appeal site.

12. The appellant has stated the removal of the black boarding from the principal elevation was justified due to their religious beliefs. However, no alternatives to the black colouring were offered that may have better maintained the Tudor appearance of the property and in any event I must assess the proposal that is before me concerning its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

### **Conclusion**

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

*J N Seymour*

INSPECTOR