



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 09 September 2019

by A Denby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/19/3232482

1 Manor House Drive, Northwood, HA6 2UJ

- 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 Deepak Khullar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 27306/APP/2018/3045, dated 17 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two-storey building to provide 5x two-bedroom flats, private and communal amenity space, 5 car parking spaces and 8 covered and secured cycle spaces together with refuse provision.
-

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 surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey detached dwelling occupying a prominent corner location within an established residential area. Although the existing access to the site is from Manor House Drive, the dwelling itself fronts on to, and is viewed in the context of existing development along Ducks Hill Road.
4. There is a linear arrangement to the development on Ducks Hill Road, which climbs up steeply to the south, with properties being set well back from the frontage. Whilst there is variety in the size and design of the dwellings, their heights generally follow the level change in the road, providing a stepped appearance.
5. The appeal site is reflective of this established pattern of development, and although it has a wide frontage, the first floor is inset from the site boundaries and the roof slope is not extensive. As the dwelling is at a lower ground level than Manor House Drive, it is predominately only the first floor and roof which are visible from the street. The existing boundary wall and tree planting to the frontage also provide some screening of the dwelling. Consequently, the dwelling is not overly prominent within the street scene and it nestles in with the scale and stepped arrangement of development along Ducks Hill Road.

6. The proposal however would result in a substantial building on the site with a bulky roof, which would appear disproportionally large in comparison with the rest of the building. The building would also be in close proximity to its side boundaries, and due to the level changes between the site and surrounding area the roof would be the dominant feature of the building. Considering this and the corner location of the site, the building would be a prominent and incongruous addition within the streetscene.
7. It is acknowledged that there is great variety in the size and design of properties in the surrounding area, and that a number include crown roofs. However, these are predominately set well back from their frontage and are set within the linear arrangement of development on Ducks Hill Road. Their overall size and bulk, in particular their roof forms, are not as prominent within the streetscene as their side elevations are not as visible.
8. As identified above, the appeal site differs in that it occupies a prominent corner location. The full scale and bulk of the roof will be clearly visible, and it will be the dominant feature of the building. The proposal would therefore be conspicuous within the streetscene and fail to respond to the prevailing pattern of development which would result in harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.
9. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies 2012, which requires all new development to achieve high quality design and make a positive contribution to the local area; Policies BE13 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two- Unitary Development Plan 1998 saved Policies, 2012, which seek to ensure developments harmonise with the streetscene and complement or improve the character of the area, as supported by the Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document - Residential Layouts 2006; Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan 2016, which seek high quality housing developments and the design policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.
10. The Council's Decision notice refers to Policy BE15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two- Unitary Development Plan 1998 – saved policies, 2012. This Policy relates to changes to existing buildings. As the appeal scheme involves demolition and new build, I have not found any conflict with this Policy.
11. Whilst a number of developments in the surrounding area are for large flat schemes, I note the Council have raised no objection to the principle of the appeal scheme. I also note that the Framework emphasises the need to support efficient use of land and that the proposal would provide additional dwellings. Whilst I have taken this into account, I do not consider these benefits would be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has referred to a previous Inspector's decision (reference: APP/R5510/W/17/3180250) relating to the redevelopment of the site for 6 flats. Although this is the same nature of development as the appeal scheme, I note that there has been a reduction in the number of flats and the height and design amended by the appellant in an attempt to overcome the previous Inspector's concerns.

13. Whilst it is acknowledged that the current appeal scheme has made some changes such as the removal of a crown roof section and dormer windows it is still predominately on the same footprint, though there is a noticeable reduction in depth to the part of the building adjacent to No 70 Ducks Hill Road.
14. However, the maximum height of the building would be greater, and the bulk of the roof has been significantly increased. It would be the dominant feature of the building, particularly when viewed from Manor House Drive. As I have detailed above, due to the proximity to the side boundary and corner location of the site the proposal would be a prominent and conspicuous addition within the streetscene. I note the previous Inspector was similarly concerned with the overall bulk and prominence of the proposal and this is not resolved by the current scheme.
15. The appellant has also referred to previous applications to extend the existing property which they consider allowed for a similar increase in footprint to the appeal scheme. I have not been provided with the full details of those applications. Even if they did allow for a similar sized footprint there is nothing to suggest the overall scale and bulk of the proposals was comparable and nonetheless, I must consider the appeal scheme on its own merits.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Denby

INSPECTOR