
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2017

by S D Harley BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI ARICS

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

Decision date: 1st March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3167287
66 Dene Road, Northwood HA6 2DF

- 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 Ms Samia Malik against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 46744/APP/2016/3165, dated 19 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is part two storey, part single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for part two storey, part single storey side extension at 66 Dene Road, Northwood HA6 2DF in accordance with the terms of the planning application Ref 46744/APP/2016/3165, dated 19 August 2016 and the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Procedural Matter

2. Although expressed differently on the appeal form it has been confirmed that the appellant is Ms Samia Malik.

Main Issue

3. I consider the main issue for this appeal to be the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host property, the attached house, the street scene and the Dene Road Area of Special Local Character.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling. It is in a predominately residential area and is part of the Dene Road Area of Special Local Character (the ASLC). Policies in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies 2012 and the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (the LP) together seek to ensure that development conserves and enhances the distinctive and varied environment of Hillingdon including locally recognised historic features of ASLCs¹. In particular Policy BE13 seeks to ensure development harmonises with the street scene and other features worthy of retention and Policy HE1 seeks to conserve the distinct and varied environment of different parts of the Borough, including ASLCs. More detailed guidance concerning residential extensions is provided in the Hillingdon Design

¹Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE5, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012)

and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions 2008 (the HDAS).

5. The ASLC has been described by the Council as partly reflecting the established gardens and sylvan character of the area². During my site visit I observed the area to be an attractive established residential area with dwellings of varied types, sizes and architectural styles. Many are large dwellings sited behind grass verges and spacious front gardens/drives with established trees and shrubs. No 66 is within an area covered by Tree Protection Order 90 although there are no protected trees in its garden.
6. The house at No 66 and the attached house, No 68, are amongst the smaller of the houses on this part of Dene Road. Some of the houses including Nos 66-68 have stepped footprints and complex mixtures of hipped and gabled roofs. The plot widths vary with some houses being separated from the adjoining side boundaries by a path whereas others have wider space between them. No 66 has a broadly triangular plot that tapers to the rear whereas the adjacent property No 64 has a plot that widens to the rear.
7. Nos 66-68 are of an attractive Victorian appearance that is symmetrical as viewed from the street. The existing building includes a shared hipped roof to the front and set back gable roofed projections to the side elevations.
8. The proposed development would include a two storey element behind and wider than the existing side projection. This would have a gable wall facing towards Dene Road. The roof over the proposed two storey extension would be similar in height to the two storey side projection and would be lower than the top of the hipped roof in front. The proposed single storey side extension would be set back from the front of the house and would wrap around the existing side projection. Both of these extensions would exceed the set back from the front elevation sought by the HDAS to ensure a subordinate appearance in relation to the existing house.
9. The proposed extensions would make No 66 wider than No 68 which would unbalance the symmetry of the pair of houses. This would be contrary to that part of Policy BE5 of the LP which requires extensions to respect the symmetry of the original building. However, as the extensions would be well set back, they would not be prominent or intrusive and in this respect would not materially detract from the appearance of the pair of houses, the street scene or the ASLC. Moreover, a number of nearby properties including the semi-detached houses Nos 64-62 and Nos 70-72 have what appear to have been originally symmetrical buildings but which now have unsymmetrical side extensions and in this respect the proposal would not be unusual on this stretch of Dene Road.
10. The proposed extensions would be set in from the boundary with No 64, which itself is set in from the shared boundary and has a different house design to that of No 66. The overall retained distance to the boundary would appear, from the plans, at the closest point to be slightly less than the 1m sought by the HDAS. However, as the house at No 64 is of a different design it is unlikely that the houses would combine visually to form a terraced appearance even should extensions take place at the neighbouring property in the future.

² Section 3 of the Report of the Head of Planning and Enforcement

11. The proposed extensions would infill a stepped rectangle at the side/rear of No 66. The two storey extension would not project more 3.6m from rear wall of the main house and the single storey element would not project further than the existing single storey extension. The Council raises no objections in respect of the effect on the living conditions of occupiers of adjoining properties. For these reasons even though the overall depth of the extension would be some 5.2m³ and, whether or not the proposal would double the floor space of the original property, I conclude the proposal would not be significantly at odds with those aims of the LP and the guidance in the HDAS that seek to ensure extensions appear subordinate to the original dwelling and do not adversely affect the amenities enjoyed by occupiers of adjacent dwellings.
12. There would be likely to be some loss of mature vegetation. However, the submitted plans indicate the retention, albeit pruned, of the hedge to the side of the property.
13. The proposed windows, doors and roof pitches are in keeping with the existing and the use of matching materials for external surfaces of the extensions could be secured by a condition. Accordingly the proposed extensions would satisfy the requirements of Policy BE5 which requires development in an ASLC to harmonise with the materials, design features, architectural style and building heights predominate in the area.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, although there are conflicts with some parts of the LP and the HDAS, on balance taken as a whole I consider the proposed development would not materially affect the character and appearance of the host property, the attached house, the street scene or the ASLC. Accordingly it would not conflict with the LP taken as a whole or those principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) that seek to ensure developments respect the character and appearance of the local area. Taking into account all relevant matters raised I conclude the appeal should succeed.

Conditions

15. I have considered the conditions proposed by the Council in the light of the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. As well as the standard condition specifying the time limits for commencement of development compliance with the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. Materials for external surfaces should match those of the existing building in the interests of the appearance of the area.
16. Conditions to protect the hedge and to ensure replacement planting as appropriate are necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the ASLC.

SDHarley

INSPECTOR

³ Section 5 of the Report of the Head of Planning and Enforcement

Schedule of conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) 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.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL/66DR/01 Rev C and PL/66DR/02.
- 4) No site clearance or construction work shall take place until the details have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority with respect to:
 1. A method statement outlining the sequence of development on the site including demolition, building works and hedge protection measures.
 2. Detailed drawings showing the position and type of fencing to protect the side boundary hedge and other vegetation to be retained. No site clearance works or development shall be commenced until these drawings have been approved and the fencing has been erected in accordance with the details approved. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority such fencing should be a minimum height of 1.5 metres. Thereafter, the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details. The fencing shall be retained in position until development is completed. The area within the approved protective fencing shall remain undisturbed during the course of the works and in particular in these areas:
 - 2.a There shall be no changes in ground levels;
 - 2.b No materials or plant shall be stored;
 - 2.c No buildings or temporary buildings shall be erected or stationed.
 - 2.d No materials or waste shall be burnt; and.
 - 2.e No drain runs or other trenches shall be dug or otherwise created, without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.
- 5) The side boundary hedge shown to be retained on the approved plan shall not be damaged, uprooted, felled, lopped or topped without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority. If any retained hedge is removed or severely damaged during construction, or is found to be seriously diseased or dying, another hedge or shrub shall be planted at the same place or, if planting in the same place would leave the new hedge or shrub susceptible to disease, then the planting shall be of a size, species and position first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Where damage is less severe, a schedule of remedial works of pruning, feeding or groundwork necessary to ameliorate the effect of damage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. New planting shall comply with BS 3936 (1992) 'Nursery Stock, Part 1, Specification for Trees and Shrubs'. Remedial work should be carried out in accordance with BS 3998:2010 'Tree work - Recommendations' and BS 4428 (1989) 'Code of Practice for General Landscape Operations (Excluding Hard Surfaces)'. The approved work shall be completed in the first planting season following the completion of the extensions.

End of conditions