



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 February 2019

by David Storrie DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/18/3218429

34 Watford Road, Northwood, HA6 3NT

- 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 & Mrs Lothian against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 29142/APP/2018/2765, dated 25 July 2018, was refused by notice dated 28 September 2018.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and first floor side extension to include a front dormer and 2 rear rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension and first floor side extension to include a front dormer and 2 rear rooflights at 34 Watford Road, Northwood, HA6 3NT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 29142/APP/2018/2765, dated 25 July 2018, subject to the following condition
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: IA.18023.20 A, IA.18023.21, IA.18023.22, IA.18023.23, IA.18023.24, IA.18023.25, IA.18023.01 A, IA.18023.02 A, IA.18023.03 A, IA.18023.04, and IA.18023.05.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council amended the description of the proposed development to include reference to the proposed front dormer and two rear rooflights. I have used this description of the proposal from the Council's decision notice. It adequately describes the proposed development to include elements that were missing on the application form. I also note that the appeal form uses the amended description. I consider that this more accurately reflects the proposed development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area having regard to the reduction in the gap between No. 34 and 36 Watford Road.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on the south side of Watford Road and comprises a detached property set back and slightly down from the highway. It shares the same access with 36 Watford Road. The surrounding area is characterised by both detached and semi-detached residential dwellings with a variety of designs and sizes as well as varied spacing between properties.
5. Both 34 and 36 are set at a lower level than the road and are screened by a timber fence with hedge and a number of evergreen trees which together limit views into the site. The trees are covered by a Tree Preservation Order¹ (TPO). There is a small gap between the two properties where single storey attached garages adjoin each other.
6. Whilst there are views over these garages, they are limited given the existing set back from the road, the level changes and existing front boundary treatment. Given the presence of the Tree Preservation Order, this screening has a degree of permanence. The proposed first floor side extension has been designed so that it would be subordinate to the host dwelling and would have a hipped roof sloping away from the boundary with 36. As such, there would still be space between both properties, and it would not appear cramped.
7. The first-floor side extension would be built over an existing single storey side extension. Policy BE22 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) states that two or more storey extensions should be set back a minimum of 1m from the side boundary. This policy serves to protect the character and appearance of streets in the Borough preserving the visually open gaps between properties and preventing dwellings from coalescing visually to form a terraced appearance, uncharacteristic of the surrounding area.
8. On the face of it the first-floor side extension would be in conflict with this policy, but I consider that the dormer style design and set back from the front elevation, would assist in preventing visual coalescence with the neighbouring property and would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the street.
9. The extension has been designed so it would be subordinate to the host dwelling in matching materials. I can see no conflict with Policies BE1, BE13, BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions, that, amongst other things, seek to secure a high quality of design where development has no adverse impact on an areas character and appearance.

Conclusion

10. Notwithstanding the identified conflict with Policy BE22, I consider that this is overcome by the design and scale of the proposed extension.

TPO 16 Land to the east of Watford Road and south of Elgood avenue, Northwood

11. For the above reasons and having had regard to all other matters raised, it is concluded that the appeal should succeed, and planning permission should be granted.

David Storrie

INSPECTOR