



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 August 2019

by D. Szymanski, BSc (Hons) MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3234767

3 Frithwood Avenue, Northwood, HA6 3LY

- 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 Joanna Fuller against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref: 7296/APP/2019/1485 dated 3 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 July 2019.
 - The development proposed the erection of a shed style dormer extension to existing habitable roof space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The original planning application was made by Joanna Fuller, but the appeal form listed the appellant as Mr Charles Fuller. It has subsequently been confirmed that the appellant is Joanna Fuller, as set out in the banner above.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are: the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling; and, whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Northwood Frithwood Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a large attractive detached arts and crafts style dwelling located within the Northwood Frithwood Conservation Area (the NFCA) of which the appeal site garden forms part of the northern boundary. Although there appears to have been some ground floor additions, the dwelling retains much of its original character and features, appearing as a fine example of an arts and crafts style property. It is understood the NFCA was originally designated due to, and the boundaries tightly drawn around, individually designed detached arts and crafts style dwellings deemed to have a high visual quality.
5. The main section of the rear roof would accommodate the proposed dormer and window, between a large cross-gable and a modestly sized first floor window partly set into the roof. The proposed dormer structure would be a sizeable addition to the roof slope with the top of the dormer structure tapering

- into the main roof slope below its ridge at the same height as the ridge of the cross-gable, and at its base would taper into the roof approximately 1.5m above the eaves. The roof of the dormer structure would be at a shallow pitch which would not relate well and not be in keeping with the steeper main roof pitches. Whilst the cross-gable would provide a degree of screening, the proposed dormer would appear as a significant extrusion, with different shapes, proportions, angles and window alignment. This would be out of keeping with and harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
6. For the reasons set out above, the proposed development would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012) (the Local Plan), saved Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (adopted 1998) (saved September 2007) (the UDP) and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) (the Framework). These, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development is of a high quality of design, harmonises with features of the host building it is desirable to retain, and makes a positive contribution to and enhances the area in terms of form and scale. By reason of its shape and form the proposed development does not adhere to the advice set out in paragraph 7.4 of the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, Residential Extensions (2008) (the SPD).
 7. Many dwellings in this part of the NFCA, including the appeal site are set within generous landscaped verdant plots. This results in the upper storeys and substantial roofs appearing as prominent features such that they are considered to form an important part of the character and appearance of NFCA. The scale, location and appearance of the appeal site means it makes a notable contribution to the character and appearance of the north western part of the NFCA.
 8. Within the NFCA there is a statutory duty under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Paragraph 193 of the Framework requires that when considering the impact upon the significance of a heritage asset great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal (paragraph 196).
 9. Visibility of the proposed development would be limited to the rear and side of the dwelling, largely restricted to neighbouring and nearby dwellings and their gardens. However, by reason of its height, shape and proportions it would neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the NFCA, and would cause a small amount of harm to an element of the NFCA that makes a positive contribution to its significance.
 10. The appellant has referred to the proposed development facilitating modifications to the stairs which would help make them safer, which I note. However, based on the evidence before me, I am not persuaded that the development as proposed is necessary to achieve this, or represents the only way of achieving that objective. The development would result in some minor temporary benefit from the development to the local construction industry, and once complete there would be some benefit to the appellant in terms of the use

of the dwelling. However, based on the evidence before me, these and any other benefits of the scheme would not outweigh the harm to the NFCA.

11. For the reasons set out above the development would be contrary to Policy BE4 of the UDP and Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2016) because amongst other things it would not preserve or enhance features that contribute to the special architectural, visual qualities or significance of the NFCA. Furthermore, the proposed development results in a small amount of harm to the significance of a heritage asset which it is not considered is outweighed by the public benefits. This is contrary to paragraph 196 of the Framework.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has drawn my attention to and has quoted differing measurements to those in the planning officer's report. Due to the shape and angles of the dormer and its adjoining pitched roofs on two sides, it is possible to report different dimensions and measurements, depending upon where the measurements are taken on the roof pitches and the dormer. The submitted scaled plans before me give a clear and precise depiction of the proposed development, and I have determined the appeal based on the submitted plans.

Conclusion

13. The proposed development would be contrary to the development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework and there are no other considerations, including the policies of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. Accordingly, for the reasons given, the appeal should not succeed.

Dan Szymanski

INSPECTOR