

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 August 2023

by A Veevers BA(Hons) DipBCon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3318410

32 Cedars Drive, Hillingdon, Uxbridge UB10 0JU

- 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 Mrs H Sappal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 8951/APP/2022/3747, dated 12 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is K-rendering to external surfaces.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for K-rendering to external surfaces at 32 Cedars Drive, Hillingdon, Uxbridge UB10 0JU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 8951/APP/2022/3747, dated 12 December 2022, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: Drawing Ref: A102 Proposed

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of development in the banner heading above from the application form, omitting wording that is not an act of development.
3. All the external wall surfaces of the dwelling have been rendered and therefore I am considering this appeal retrospectively.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the render on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site consists of a 2-storey detached dwelling located within a residential area. Cedars Drive forms part of a wider estate of predominantly detached, semi-detached, single and 2-storey properties set behind front gardens with private amenity spaces to the rear. The majority of the properties in the area are of a similar age and are constructed in brick with white window frames and brown pantile roofs. There is a variety of house types and brick colour with differing design features including hip and gable roofs, porches, bays and projecting gables. However, the overall character of the area is of a suburban layout with a harmonious variety of dwellings.
6. The appeal dwelling has recently been extended by virtue of appeal decision APP/R5510/D/21/3273927. While the full details of this permission are not

before me, I have been provided with a copy of the decision. Condition 3 of the permission states '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'. I am informed that the materials used in the original dwelling were brick with a brown tile clad panel on the first-floor front elevation and a white uPVC panel below the ground floor window, similar in appearance to the dwellings either side of the appeal site. The whole of the building, including the extensions, have been rendered. The Council indicate that this does not comply with condition 3 of the appeal decision. This has not been disputed by the appellant.

7. From the information before me, the pale grey render and dark grey window frames used on the appeal dwelling have a very different appearance to that which previously existed in terms of colour and texture. The dwelling is readily visible in the street and it would have sat amongst a small group of properties of similar appearance. However, the dwelling is now markedly dissimilar to the other dwellings in this group.
8. Nevertheless, dwellings that differ in appearance due to the materials used can positively contribute to the diversity of an area and add visual interest to the street scene to which they belong. While the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (the Framework) indicates that it is proper to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness, the surrounding area includes a variety of house designs and sizes.
9. Whilst the present lack of a front boundary enclosure and vegetation at the appeal site draws the eye to the site, the varied appearance of properties in terms of house-type provides an opportunity for appropriate change where it would not appear overly prominent, dominant or undermine local distinctiveness or sense of place. In that respect, I observed at my site visit that although the unifying material in much of the surrounding area is brick, due to differing brick colours and the application of render panels and sections on brick-built dwellings in the vicinity of the appeal site, the appeal scheme is not wholly out of keeping with the character of the area in respect of materials. Even though the rendered dwellings in Attle Close and Mills Close are located on cul-de-sacs, they are nonetheless in reasonable proximity to the appeal site.
10. Moreover, even if the external materials used in the approved extension did not match the original brick building, the rendering of the whole property has resulted in the successful cohesive integration of the extensions. I find the contrast of render to the appeal property results in a contemporary appearance which, although departs from the more subdued appearance of neighbouring properties, acceptably assimilates with the interspersed nature of the palettes of materials of properties that are characteristic of the area and which include use of render.
11. I conclude that the render does not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. I therefore find that the proposal would not conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 Strategic Policies 2012, Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies 2020 and Policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan 2021. The aforementioned policies, when taken together and, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development has a high standard of design that harmonises and is well integrated with the existing street or wider

area, enhances the local distinctiveness of the area and contributes to a sense of place.

Other Matters

12. I note the appellant's frustration with the Council in respect of the advice provided prior to works on the rendering of the property commencing. However, this has had no bearing on the outcome of this appeal as I have only had regard to the planning merits of the proposal that is before me.

Conditions

13. The Council has indicated the conditions it considers necessary on its questionnaire which I have considered against the tests of Paragraph 56 of the Framework and advice provided in Planning Practice Guidance. Conditions in respect of the commencement of the development and matching materials are not required as the development has commenced. A condition specifying the approved plans is necessary in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Veevers

INSPECTOR