



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2019

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3237028

215 Thirlmere Gardens, Northwood, HA6 2GA

- 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 S Rodway against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 74635/APP/2019/1670, dated 17 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side/rear extension at 215 Thirlmere Gardens, Northwood, HA6 2GA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 74635/APP/2019/1670, dated 17 May 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 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: Location Plan, 215/0; 215/1 Rev A; 215/2; 215/3 Rev B; 215/5; 215/6 Rev B; 215/8 Rev A.
 - 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.

Procedural Matters

2. I have used the Council's description of development in the above banner heading as it accurately and concisely describes the proposed development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey dwelling, located at the end of a row of terrace properties of a similar design. It is positioned at the end of a cul-de sac which comprises of a large number of residential properties of varying design and appearance.

5. The appeal property is staggered forward of the remaining terrace which it forms part of. The proposal is for a two storey side and rear extension, however, the Council's concerns relate solely to the two storey side extension.
6. The proposed two storey side extension would be set back from the front elevation of the host dwelling by 2 metres. Whilst the front eaves height of the extension would match that of the existing dwelling, the proposed extension would be set down from the main ridge by 0.7 metres. The extension would have a width of 1.17 metres and would be set off the side boundary by a metre. Whilst the extension would have considerable depth, it would 'tie in' with the proposed rear extension to which the Council has not objected.
7. The proposed side extension would be visible from the head of the cul-de-sac to the front of the dwelling. It would not however, be unduly prominent given its limited width and positioning in the corner of the cul-de-sac. The depth of the extension would not be apparent in the street scene. The proposed extension would be set back from the front elevation of the host property by 2 metres and this, together with its lower ridge height, would ensure that it would appear as a subordinate addition to the dwelling and to the terrace as a whole. In my view, the design of the proposed extension would be in keeping with that of the host property, with the alignment of the front roof slope reflecting that of the main dwelling. Overall, I find that the extension would harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and would be appropriate in terms of its size, scale, bulk and design. Furthermore, in respecting the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the proposal would not be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the wider terrace or the street scene and surrounding area.
8. The proposal would generally accord with the design guidance set out in the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions (December 2008) (the 'SPD'), other than in respect of detached and terraced houses, the guidance states that the roof height of a two storey extension should be equal to that of the main house. However, the SPD is for guidance purposes and in this particular case, I recognise the benefits of lowering the height of the extension such that it would appear subordinate to the host dwelling and thus reducing its prominence in the street scene.
9. In conclusion, the proposal would comply with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (November 2012), and Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies which collectively require development to be of a high quality design which improves and maintains the quality of the built environment and the character of the area and which harmonises with the existing street scene, and the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the original building.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard 3 years implementation condition, the approved plans condition is imposed for clarity. I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be constructed with matching materials in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR