
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2017

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 14 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3164719
36 Elgood Avenue, Northwood HA6 3QS

- 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 and Mrs S and M Sabharwal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 41204/APP/2016/3668, dated 3 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey front extension to porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mainly 2-storey detached house of individual design in a street of similar properties within the Gatehill Farm Estate Area of Special Local Character (ASLC). The ASLC is predominantly residential in character within which detached dwellings are mostly set within generous landscaped plots often with relatively open frontages. Consequently, the front elevations of buildings form a noticeable feature of the streetscape within the ASLC and, for the most part, positively contribute to the qualities and character of this designated area. The appeal dwelling is one such example.
 4. At the front of No 36 are two single storey projections with one set back from the other. Each projection has a mono-pitched roof although the angle of the slope differs between them. The proposal is primarily to draw the front of one of these projections further forward to enlarge the sitting room and hallway. In itself, the new addition would be modest in scale, depth and height. The external materials would match those of the host building and the fenestration would broadly replicate the existing arrangement save for the introduction of slim, full-length windows on either side of a modern style front door.
 5. The new extension would step forward of the 2-storey main house and still be set back from the existing single storey projection at the front of the dwelling. In itself, the proposal would be a subordinate addition and the staggered front
-

build line to the dwelling would be maintained. The new roof would also be set at the same height and pitch as the existing roof with which it would connect. It would however, result in a long mono-pitched roof extending across much of the new front elevation that despite the set back along its length would visually 'read' as a single entity.

6. In views from Elgood Avenue just in front of the property, the roof above the new and existing projections would draw the eye because it would appear overly long and large and thus ill proportioned in relation to the host building. By introducing an incongruous form of development, the proposed extension would spoil the intrinsic character of the host building and be obtrusive in the street scene, to the detriment of the area's qualities and character.
7. On the main issue, I therefore conclude that the proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of the local area. As such, it is contrary to Policy BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies and Policies BE5, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies. These policies aim to ensure that new development harmonises with the original building and the existing street scene; conserves or enhances recognised features such as ASLCs; and complements or improves the character of the area. These principles underpin the advice within the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document, with which the proposal would also conflict.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above, and taking into account the absence of objections from others, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR