



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2019

by B Davies MSc FGS CGeol

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3238485

14 Wieland Road, Northwood, HA6 3QU

- 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 Sarju Mehta against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 54788/APP/2019/2397, dated 16 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is 'part two storey, part single storey rear extension, first floor side extension, part conversion of attached garage to habitable use, conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a rear dormer and 6x side rooflights, and alterations to rear elevation'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the rear extension and dormer on the character and appearance of the original dwelling and street scene.

Reasons

3. Wieland Road comprises detached, two-storey houses, clearly designed with a sense of balance and symmetry, and with distinctive architectural details on older houses, of which No 14 is a typical example. There is variety in the design of roofs and several properties in the locality have roof alterations, including roof lights and dormers. The site is in the Gatehill Farm Estate, Northwood, Area of Special Local Character (ASLC), in which the Council seeks to preserve and enhance local character and appearance. In this case, relevant aspects are that houses are well detailed and of high architectural quality.
4. The proposed rear extension is a large addition to the house, but an identical extension at the site has been given recent permission by the Council and from this I conclude there are no objections to the size of the extension in principle. I am therefore focusing on the effects from the proposed addition of a box dormer.
5. I was unable to clearly view the property at the site visit because it was covered with a tarpaulin and am therefore working from the plans provided with the application.

6. The rear dormer, when added to an already large extension, would remove the original sense of architectural balance of the host house because the height of the dormer would be significantly above that of the front gable and overall, would not appear proportionate to the building. In addition, the set-ins of the dormer from the ridge level, the eaves and the sides of the roof would be less than 1 m, in conflict with paragraph 7.8 of the adopted Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document (2008), a material consideration to which I give substantial weight given the need to preserve architectural quality in the ASLC. The extension with box dormer would therefore neither harmonise with or be proportionate to the original house, as required in Policy BE15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 – Saved UDP Policies (November 2012)(HLP, PT2). Substantial weight is also given to the additional protection afforded to the area as an ASLC, including the requirement of Policy BE5 of the HLP, PT 2 for extensions to respect the symmetry of the original buildings.
7. The site is in an elevated position when viewed from the public highway to the west, but prominence is reduced by a backdrop of houses and trees behind, and as the dormer would be at the rear of the building it is considered unlikely that it would be visible from this direction. However, the box dormer would be visible from the public highway to the east, albeit obscured by high hedges and lessened by dint of being at a lower elevation. Policies BE13 and BE19 of the HLP, PT2 require that residential development harmonises with the street scene and complements or improves the character of the area, and Policy BE1 of the HLP, PT1 requires that new developments enhance local distinctiveness and make a positive contribution in terms of form and scale. Whilst not considered an especially positive development, when viewed in the context of common and visible dormers in the area, a rear dormer is not considered in principle to be out of harmony or to damage the appearance of the street scene. However, as designed, it is damaging to the host building and therefore damages the character of the ASLC, the protection of which I give substantial weight.

Conclusions

8. The proposed dormer as designed, when added to a large extension, would detract from the character and appearance of original dwelling and therefore the ASLC, in conflict with local development plan policies. For this reason, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Davies

Inspector