

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2023

by L Reid BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/23/3317377

63 Cranbourne Road, Northwood HA6 1JZ

- 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 Dean Thompson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 64354/APP/2022/3106, dated 5 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of front open porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the planning application form. Although it is different to that on the decision notice, no confirmation has been provided that the change to the wording of the description was agreed by both parties.
3. The appellant submitted an amended front elevation drawing as part of their appeal. This amendment proposes to reduce the height of the porch in order to address the Council's concerns. The Procedural Guide to Planning Appeals – England states that the appeal process should not be used to evolve proposals and is clear that revisions intended to overcome reasons for refusal should normally be tested through a fresh planning application.
4. Whilst the suggested design amendment is shown on the proposed front elevation drawing, it is not clear if the other proposed elevation drawings have not been amended to reflect this reduction in height. As such, in the interests of accuracy, I must base my decision upon the plans that were assessed by the Council during the original planning determination.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is a detached house with an open arched porch and projecting hipped roof garage. The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of housing types and designs. Whilst some of the houses have been altered, they share common features of bay windows, garages and porches which positively contribute to the character and appearance of the area. Generally, where

houses on the road have a porch that projects forward of the front building line, the porch appears to not directly adjoin the other projecting elements.

7. The existing garage extends past the front building line and partially across the front elevation. As the porch would be directly adjacent to the garage, this would leave no visible space between it and the garage. Consequently, the porch would be seen in conjunction with the garage. Due to its height, scale and shape of its roof, the porch would be at odds with the simple form of the garage. These two features would therefore not relate well to each other. As a result, the proposal would appear as a disjointed addition detracting from the existing cohesive appearance. As the porch would extend past the front building line of a similar depth to the garage, when combined with its height, this would unacceptably dominate the front elevation.
8. My attention has been drawn to other houses on the road that are considered to be similar to the appeal site and also have porches and garage extensions. On my site visit, I saw that these referenced examples are sufficiently different from the appeal scheme. This is because at these houses the porch appears to not be attached at its sides to the other projecting features. This gap creates an element of physical separation with the porch viewed as an individual feature, unlike the proposed porch. Given the differences in design, these examples would not weigh in support of the proposal.
9. I therefore conclude that due to its design, depth, height, scale and siting, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. The proposal would therefore conflict with 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). Taken together, these policies require porches to be of a high-quality design that respects the features of the host building and seeks to ensure that development does not have an adverse cumulative impact on character and appearance in order to positively contribute to the area.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, I find that the proposal conflicts with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations that have been shown to carry sufficient weight to indicate a decision otherwise in accordance with it. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Reid

INSPECTOR