



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2023

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14TH August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3324327

301 Lansbury Drive, Hayes, Hillingdon, UB4 8RZ

- 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 Shiharan against the decision of The Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 73850/APP/2023/333, dated 3 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 3 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as 'The proposed work includes reconstruction of the porch with double external door with a front canopy which sits on pillars'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. At the time of my site visit the development was complete. The application made clear that the scheme was submitted retrospectively, and I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey, semi-detached dwelling, located in a road comprising of similar dwellings. The proposal is for a front porch and canopy which has already been constructed.
5. Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020) (the Local Plan: Part 2) states that alterations and extensions to the front of a house must be minor and not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street. Front extensions extending across the entire frontage will be refused. It also requires porches to be subordinate in scale and individually designed to respect the character and features of the original building and states that pastiche features will not be supported.
6. The width of the front porch is similar to others found in the local area, many of which also display a front gable feature. The proposed porch also has a shallow overhanging canopy supported by two columns although its overall

depth remains modest. The porch is of a height which sits below cill of the window above and in my view, it appears sufficiently subordinate to the host dwelling.

7. The proposed canopy, whilst extending across the front elevation of the dwelling, is also shallow in depth and given that it is not enclosed, I do not consider it to be overly dominant. There would be no conflict with Policy DMHD 1 of the Local Plan: Part Two in this respect.
8. However, the decorative columns which support the porch overhang and the canopy are of a rather 'pastiche' design which Policy DMHD 1 seeks to avoid. In my view the columns are overly elaborate and contrast sharply with the simple design and appearance of the host dwelling and other nearby properties. The columns stand out as a particularly prominent and incongruous feature which I find harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
9. Thus, the proposal is contrary Policy DMHD 1 of the Local Plan: Part 2 insofar as it seeks to ensure that front extensions do not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street and that front porches respect the character and features of the original building. It is also contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policy DMHB 11 of the Local Plan: Part Two which amongst other things, seek to ensure developments are of high quality design which respects the design of the original house and harmonises with the local context.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has stated that there are other similar porches and canopies in the surrounding area although no specific examples have been provided. I am therefore unable to determine whether there are any similarities between the other examples and the appeal proposal. In any event, I am required to determine the appeal on its own merits.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR