



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 June 2025

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/25/3364151

26 Sanctuary Close, Harefield, Hillingdon, UB9 6LJ

- 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 Jane Muyingo against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 79171/APP/2025/232.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a new porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a new porch at 26 Sanctuary Close, Harefield, Hillingdon, UB9 6LJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 79171/APP/2025/232, and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matter

2. At the time of my visit, I saw that the porch was in situ and that the development was complete.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the porch upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a three-storey, terraced house set within a residential estate cul-de-sac dating from approximately the 1970s comprising two separate central parking courtyards with terraced properties arranged around the perimeters. The fronts of the houses have protruding ground floor garages and ground floor entrance doors to the side, with recessed first and second storeys above. The flat roof above each garage and entrance is used as an outdoor amenity space for the properties with an access door set to one side of each dwelling's first-floor front elevation. The side boundary to each of these private outdoor spaces is marked by a tall dividing brick wall. The outside edge of this first-floor space is accessible by the residents of each terrace as a walkway.
5. The terraces around both courtyards would originally have been uniform in appearance when viewed from the front. However, I observed a plethora of changes that have percolated over the years. These extend from ground to second floor levels and include a variety of replacement garage and front entrance doors, replacement windows of different styles, stone cladding in one instance, and an

array of other alterations, enclosures and residential paraphernalia to the first-floor outside spaces. Other than the general form and scale of the dwellings within each terrace, I saw little other sense of uniformity remaining across the facades of any of the terraces, with most properties having created their own identity.

6. No 26 is a case in point. The dwelling has replacement windows throughout and a timber fence enclosure to the front of the first-floor outside space, separating its private area from the adjacent walkway. These changes are typical of many others, all of which differ from one to another. The first-floor outside spaces to the front of most properties are generally screened from view, especially when observed from ground level. The porch at the appeal property is seen within this context. It is inconspicuous within the mixed appearance of its wider setting and, being set deeply recessed behind the protruding ground floor footprint of the building, is only glimpsed and then as a mere modest addition within an enclosed space. I found nothing about its presence that was overtly discordant, dominant, or visually harmful.
7. Overall, I am satisfied that there is no harm to the character or appearance of the appeal property or wider street scene. As such, there is no conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 or DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 – Development Management Policies (2020), or Policy D3 of The London Plan 2021. Between them, and amongst other things, these seek to ensure new development is of a high standard that respects the design of the original property and harmonises with and responds to local context.
8. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed. As the development has taken place, I have no reason to impose any conditions.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR