



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 August 2023

by **Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6<sup>TH</sup> September 2023

## Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3323677

### 1 Chiltern Road, Eastcote, Hillingdon HA5 2TD

- 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 Darren Cowes against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 9383/APP/2023/477, dated 18 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 17 April 2023.
- The development is described as the creation of a first floor, a single storey rear extension, and infill of the gap between the house and the garage.

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor extension, a single storey rear extension, and an infill between the house and the garage at 1 Chiltern Road, Eastcote, Hillingdon HA5 2TD in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 9383/APP/2023/477, dated 18 February 2023, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: site location plan, site plan, and drawing nos. 20/2710/1, 20/2710/2 and 20/2710/3.
  - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building.
  - 3) The upper floor window in the east elevation shall be non-opening and fitted with obscured glazing to at least 1.7 metre above first floor level, and shall be retained so thereafter.

### Background and Procedural Matter

2. Planning permission was granted on appeal at 1 Chiltern Road ('No 1') for a single storey rear extension, the creation of a first floor, and a single storey infill between the garage and the house (Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3269047) ('previous appeal').
3. The Council raises no objection to the infill and the single storey rear extension in this scheme as these are similar to those in the previous appeal. However, it points out that compared to it, this scheme has a full gable instead of a partial hip, that it has a taller ridge and eaves, and that the side facing dormers are different.
4. I have considered the development, which has been largely completed, in this context, and having regard to the site's planning history.

## Main Issue

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

## Reasons

### *Character and appearance*

6. The properties in Chiltern Road, which include bungalows and two storey detached houses, are set back from the highway, typically with gaps to the sides, but are quite varied in terms of their scale, form and proportions. They mostly have a principally hipped roof form, although on my visit I also observed some front facing gables. The buildings are typically finished in a mix of brickwork and render. Given this diverse context, I agree with the Inspector in the previous appeal that changing the bungalow on this site to a house is not incompatible with the streetscene.
7. As No 1's footprint is the same compared to the previous appeal, the scheme has retained the lateral gaps characteristic of the road. Whilst its eaves and ridge heights are taller than in the previous appeal, taking account of the topography, in the streetscene they are not noticeably different to those at 3 Chiltern Road ('No 3'). In the context of this diverse area the building does not appear unduly bulky. The gable as built displays a subtle change in pitch roughly half way up the roof. However, whilst I did not observe any similar nearby styles, given the varied roofscape on Chiltern Road, it does not appear incongruous.
8. No 1's dormers are asymmetrical and of different design, but given that they are on opposite side elevations they are barely seen together in the streetscene. Thus, they do not significantly unbalance the building. Finally, although the windows on the front elevation occupy a modest proportion of the building's first floor front face, completing the development with render to match the host would significantly draw the architectural composition together.
9. Consequently, subject to appropriate facing materials, the scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area. It would therefore comply with Policy DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two: Development Management Policies (2020) ('HLPP2'), Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part One: Strategic Policies (2012), and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021). Amongst other things, and in general terms, these require development to be designed to the highest standards, and to harmonise with, or enhance, its context, taking account of matters such as scale, mass, bulk, appearance and shape.
10. It would also comply with the requirement for well designed places, with development which is visually attractive and sympathetic to the surrounding built environment, at Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('Framework').
11. The extensions are not cumulatively, and not all individually, subordinate to the original bungalow, and the roof form is at odds with its design. In these regards it does not comply with HLPP2 Policy DMHD 1. However, given that the scheme accords with its broad stance that extensions should avoid an

adverse impact on the character, appearance and quality of the street and the area, I give only limited weight to the conflict with part of that policy.

*Other matters*

12. No 1 is sited broadly in line with No 3, whose principal front and rear elevations do not face the site. This development's first floor side elevation is set well back from the common boundary. Having regard to the relatively modest increase in bulk and height compared to the previous appeal, I am not persuaded that the scheme before me has resulted in a harmful loss of light to that house and its long rear garden, or that it has had a significant impact on those occupiers' outlook.

**Conditions and Conclusion**

13. Turning to the matter of conditions, I have considered those suggested by the Council against the Framework's tests. As the development appears to be nearing completion, the standard time limit for commencement is not appropriate. However, in the interests of certainty, a condition is necessary requiring that it be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. In the interests of good design, I have also imposed a matching materials condition.
14. Finally, having regard to the Council's delegated report and the previous appeal, in the interests of the living conditions of the nearest neighbouring occupiers at No 3, I have imposed a condition requiring that the first floor east-facing window be obscurely glazed.
15. Summing up, subject to a matching materials condition, the scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area. Consequently, having regard to all other matters raised, including representations by interested parties, the appeal is allowed.

*Chris Couper*

INSPECTOR