
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2020

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3240530

Five Rivers, 10 Hill Road, Northwood HA6 2DQ

- 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 Gill against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 1965/APP/2019/1938, dated 7 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is part two storey, part single storey side/rear extensions and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a front dormer, 2 rear dormers and 4 roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Since the Council refused planning permission it has adopted the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies 2020 (P2LP). As a result, the Policies within that document carry full weight and they have replaced the Local Plan Part 2 Saved UDP Policies 2012, which are no longer in force. The Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Extensions 2008 has also been withdrawn.
3. The Council has confirmed that the adopted P2LP Policies that it relies on are DMHB 1, DMHB 5 and DMHD 1. All of these policies were referred to in their emerging form in the Council's reasons for refusal and copies of the emerging policies were provided with the appeal documentation. The Council has subsequently provided copies of the adopted policies and there are no fundamental differences between the emerging and adopted policies that would affect the determination of the appeal.
4. On this basis, I have proceeded to determine the appeal without seeking further comments from the parties.
5. The appellant has confirmed that they agreed to the changing of the description of the development to that stated on the decision notice. This is therefore the description I have used in the banner header above.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development upon (i) the living conditions of the occupiers of 8 Hill Road with particular reference to outlook and (ii) the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, the surrounding area and the Dene Road Area of Special Local Character.

Reasons

Living conditions

7. The proposed side extension would be located adjacent to the common boundary with 8 Hill Road. Whilst No 8 fronts onto Hill Road, it is orientated so that many of its windows face towards the appeal site. Although the proposed development would not extend along the full length of the side elevation of No 8, the section that would be located on the boundary would cause significant harm to the outlook from the windows and door which face it and from the patio area located outside of them, due to its close proximity and its two storey height. This would cause significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 8.
8. The appellant has drawn attention to the fact that some of the rooms which are served by the windows in question also have other windows. However, this does not alter the fact that the outlook from the windows facing the appeal development would be substantially impacted upon by the loss of outlook that would arise. Furthermore, this does not address the impact that would arise upon the patio area. Whilst the proposed side extension does include a hipped roof and a section of single storey flat roofed development, these factors do not adequately mitigate for the harm that would result.
9. The Council's reason for refusal does not refer specifically to a loss of light to No 8, although this matter is raised as a concern in their delegated report. However, whilst there would be some impact in this respect, due to the depth of the proposed side extension and its orientation, there would not be harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 8 through a loss of light.
10. I conclude therefore that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the occupiers of No 8 through a loss of outlook, resulting from the location and scale of the proposed side extension. The proposed development would therefore conflict with the aim of Policy DMHD 1 of the P2LP, where it seeks to protect living conditions.

Character and appearance

11. The appeal site is located within the Dene Road Area of Special Local Character (ASLC). Whilst I have not been provided with any specific details of the defining characteristics of this area, I noted during my site visit there to be a mix of dwelling types and designs arranged around private drives. The arrangement of the dwellings and the sizes of the plots they are located in gives the area a pleasant, open feel and the attractiveness of the location is supplemented by the established vegetation and planting that is present.
12. The proposed development would result in a substantial increase in the size of the existing dwelling, including in terms of its width, which would occupy the majority of the width of the appeal site. However, the dwelling is set back from Hill Road and the proposed design of the extensions would be coherent with the

general character and appearance of the existing dwelling and matching materials would be used. Although there would be a section of flat roof to the centre of the main roof, the overall pitched character of the roof would be retained. There would also be a reasonable degree of visual separation maintained between the dwellings adjacent to the site. Whilst the proposed front dormer window would appear awkward in terms of its positioning, the appellant has indicated that this could easily be severed from the scheme.

13. For these reasons and given that there is great variation in the design of the dwellings in the ASLC and in terms of their positioning and size within their respective plots, the proposed development, with the exception of the front dormer, would not have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area or the ASLC. The impact upon the dwelling itself would also be acceptable, and the design of the proposed extensions and their rendered finish would ensure that they would visually integrate well.
14. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, the surrounding area or to the ASLC. Consequently, there would be no conflict with the objectives of Policy BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies 2012 and Policy DMHB 1 of the P2LP, all of which seek to safeguard character and appearance. Whilst collectively the proposed extensions could not be considered to be subservient or subordinate to the existing dwelling, in this instance no harm to character and appearance would result from this. Therefore, the aims of Policies DMHB 5 and DMHD 1 of the P2LP would also be met.

Conclusion

15. Whilst I have not found harm to character and appearance, I have found significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 8 Hill Road and subsequent conflict with the development plan. For this reason, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR