



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 May 2017

by **Peter D Biggers** BSc Hons MRTPI

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

Decision date: 8th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3170299

51 Stanley Road, Northwood HA6 1RH.

- 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 A Jafry against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon Council.
The application Ref 72407/APP/2016/4379, dated 2 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension at 51 Stanley Road, Northwood HA6 1RH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 72407/APP/2016/4379, dated 2 December 2016, and the plans and documents submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans: 51stanleyroad/2016/10; 51stanleyroad/2016/01; 51stanleyroad/2016/02; 51stanleyroad/2016/03; 51stanleyroad/2016/04.
 - 3) 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.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the property and surroundings of Stanley Road and the Hillside, Northwood Hills Area of Special Local Character.
 - Whether the proposed development would have an adverse effect on the living conditions of present and future occupants of No 49 Stanley Road in terms of loss of light, over-dominance, visual intrusion and loss of outlook.

Reasons

3. Stanley Road, where the appeal site is located, is mainly comprised of detached dormer bungalows built in brick, render and tile and standing in large plots. The houses have common design themes but are not uniform in their design and there is an attractive variation to them. The rising form of the road, with the houses set behind front gardens and at different levels to each other, makes for an attractive
-

street scene which has been identified as part of the Hillside, Northwood Hills Area of Special Local Character (ASLC).

Character and Appearance

4. The *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) seeks a high standard of design in all development and requires development to take the opportunities available to improve the character and quality of an area. Policy BE1 of the *Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 – Strategic Policies* (HLP1) in seeking to ensure amongst other things that development achieves a high quality of design in all new building, enhancing local distinctiveness, community cohesion and sense of place is consistent with the Framework. Similarly policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the *Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Saved UDP Policies* (HLP2), although older, remain consistent with the framework. They seek to resist development that fails to harmonise with the original building and the existing streetscene or fails to complement or improve the character of the area. Specifically in respect of development in the ASLC, HLP2 policy BE5 requires development to harmonise with the materials, design features, architectural style and building heights predominant in the area. To help control extensions the Council has also published the *Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD) to ensure such development is appropriately designed.
5. The proposed rear extension would project by around 6 metres in total. It would be therefore in excess of the guideline projection distance in the SPD which advises that a rear projection of 4 metres on detached houses will normally be considered acceptable. However, there are a number of reasons why in this particular case the deeper extension would not be inappropriate in terms of character and appearance.
6. The scale of the extension, in what is a large rear garden, would not be such that it would appear over prominent or bulky compared to the existing house. Despite the comments of the Council, the extension would not extend beyond the edge of the rear wall and would be no wider than the original property. The net increase in the depth of the ground floor as a result of the proposed extension (6 metres) would not be disproportionate when compared to the ground floor depth of the original house of about 11.5 metres.
7. Moreover the extension has been designed in the style of a garden room which would incorporate full width and height bi-fold glazed panelling to the rear and would be constructed with a flat roof to sit under the eaves of the main house. The whole effect would be of a simply designed, light weight, extension sitting comfortably in the rear elevation of the house. In that respect the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the original dwelling and assist in ensuring that the extension would appear subordinate to it.
8. The proposed design of the extension, the intended matching materials and extensive use of glazing would give the extension a simple, contemporary form which would harmonise with and be complementary to the varied architectural styles in the ASLC. In any event the extension would have no impact on the street scene being completely invisible from Stanley Road. Furthermore, No 51, in common with other properties in the area, has a long deep garden with good landscape cover to its boundaries from trees and shrubs. The majority of this garden would be retained and so the attractive setting within the ASLC would not be eroded and the proposal would be effectively screened from both the public realm and to a large extent from private views.

9. For the reasons above, the appeal proposal would not adversely impact on the character and appearance of either the host dwelling or the Hillside, Northwood Hills ASLC such that it would be in conflict with either the Framework or HLP1 policies BE1 and HE1 or HLP2 policies BE5, BE13, BE15 and BE19. Notwithstanding the guidance regarding depth of rear extensions in the SPD, the proposal would accord with other aspects of the guidance on single storey rear extensions.

Living Conditions

10. The Framework in the Core Principles at paragraph 17 requires development to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. HLP1 policy BE1 in seeking to protect the amenity of surrounding land and buildings and HLP2 policies BE19, BE20 and BE21, in ensuring there is no loss of residential amenity, are consistent with the Framework. The SPD guidance seeks to ensure extensions are appropriately designed to avoid detrimental impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
11. Although as stated above the depth of the extension would exceed the 4 metres set out in the SPD, the guidance goes on at paragraph 3.15 to acknowledge that where neighbouring properties have deep extensions there may be more scope for larger rear extensions, subject to the guiding principles being satisfied and no impact on residential amenity.
12. The neighbouring property at No 53 has such a deep extension with a blank elevation on the common boundary extending almost as deep as the proposed extension at No 51. I am satisfied that there would be no adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupants at No 53 as a result of the proposal.
13. Although No 49 has no rear extension, for a number of reasons the depth of the extension proposed would not give rise to any significant adverse impacts on living conditions for the occupants. First, the rear habitable rooms of No 49 and their windows are separated from the plot boundary by the property's garage whilst the proposed extension is also set away from the side boundary by the width of No 51's garage. This degree of separation between the nearest habitable room window and the extension means that a line drawn from the centre of that window at 45° would not be breached by the proposed extension. As such the extension would not adversely impact on the outlook from the window. In any event the outlook towards the extension is already screened by a tall evergreen hedge within the plot boundary of No 49. Secondly, because of the slope on Stanley Road the floor level of No 49 is significantly higher than that of No 51. Given the flat roof and restricted height of the proposed extension (below 3 metres) the extension would not be overbearing or visually intrusive for No 49. Thirdly, there are no windows proposed in the extension facing No 49 and therefore there would be no loss of privacy. Finally, the extension would sit to the north east of the rear elevation to No 49. Given its low height and lower floor level there would be virtually no impact on levels of sunlight reaching No 49.
14. For these reasons it is not unreasonable to take a more flexible approach to the depth of the extension than that proposed in the SPD and I am satisfied that there would be no significant adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupants of No 49 in terms of light, privacy and outlook. As such the proposal would comply with HLP1 policy BE1 and HLP2 policies 19, 20 and 21.

Conditions and Conclusions

15. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against the advice in

the *Planning Practice Guidance* and for their clarity. A condition requiring development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans is necessary as this provides certainty that the development would be carried out in the form proposed. A condition requiring matching materials to be used on the external surfaces of the building should also be imposed to protect the character and appearance of the dwelling and of the surroundings to the development.

16. I have considered the matters before me and, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and permission granted subject to conditions.

P. D. Biggers

INSPECTOR