



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 August 2020

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3244268

128 Northwood Way, Northwood HA6 1RE

- 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 V Vora against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 14264/APP/2019/3128, dated 22 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as Single storey front/side extension, part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a rear dormer and 2 x front rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for a Single storey front/side extension, part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a rear dormer and 2 x front rooflights at 128 Northwood Way, Northwood HA6 1RE in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 14264/APP/2019/3128 dated 22 September 2019 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL/128NW/01 Rev A, PL/128NW/02 & PL/128NW/03.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development has been altered from the application form to the decision notice. The latter more fully describes the proposed development and I have determined the appeal on that basis.
3. The Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (DMP) were adopted as part of the borough's development plan in January 2020. Therefore, as I am required to make my decision based on the policy in place at this time, my determination on this appeal has been made in accordance with this plan alongside the pre-existing Local Plan Part 1 – Strategic Policies (2012) (SP). The Council have advised that their case primarily relies on Policies DMHB 11

and DMHD 1 of the DMP. I am advised that the SPD¹ relating to residential extensions on which much of the Officer analysis was based has been withdrawn.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:

- i. the effect of the proposal, with particular regard to its lack of set back from the principle elevation on the character and appearance of the area; and
- ii. the effect of the appeal proposal on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The area has an established residential character and is formed of largely well-established detached and semi-detached dwellings. The property to which the appeal relates is semi-detached. The area has a pleasant suburban mixed street scene and the property is opposite, but not within, the Hillside, Northwood Area of Special Local Character.
6. The size, scale and bulk of the extensions would not be out of scale with the host dwelling. The single and two storey elements to the rear would not be of excessive projection or width and the ridgelines of the two-storey extension would be set down from those on the main dwelling.
7. The northern side of the property incorporates an existing set back from the main front elevation at first floor level and a projecting garage to the ground floor. These features are evident within neighbouring properties and appear to be original or very well-established design features of the dwelling. Rather than incorporating a further set back, the two-storey side extension would be positioned in line with the existing set back at first floor level, which appears to be less than 1 metre in depth. At ground floor level, the extension would have the same forward projection as the existing garage.
8. In this regard, the proposal would be in conflict with Policy DMHD1 of the DMP which requires that two storey side extensions to semi-detached properties should be set back a minimum of 1 metre behind the main front elevation. The aim is to ensure that additions read as a subordinate element.
9. However, in relation to this particular proposal, setting the two-storey side extension back 1m behind the main front elevation would result in the introduction of a third building line at first floor level to the front elevation of the dwelling.
10. I consider that this would result in a rather cluttered and incohesive front building line which would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the dwelling and area. Therefore, I afford the existing design of this particular dwelling significant weight, in that it already incorporates a reasonable set back at first floor level. Further, the existing garage also has a

¹ Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions 2008.

slight forward projection at ground floor level. The extension would be read as a subordinate element as a result of its other design features. The weight I afford to the above matters therefore outweighs the conflict with part C) v) of Policy DMHD1 of the DMP.

11. The proposal as a whole would therefore be appropriate in relation to the character and appearance of the area and would therefore accord with Policy BE1 of the SP and Policies DMHB11 and DMHB12 of the DMP which amongst other things require high quality design which takes account of the established townscape character.

Living conditions

12. The ground floor extension would be of a similar projection to an existing single storey rear extension at No 130 to the south, while the first-floor extension would be set well away from the boundary with this property. The extension would retain an appropriate set-off from the boundary with No 126 to the north.
13. The Officer report indicates that the proposal would not be overbearing or visually intrusive and would not result in loss of outlook or light for the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings. It further indicates that the proposal would accord with guidance on the 45 degree rule.
14. I have no reason to disagree with these conclusions and I consider that the extensions have been designed in a sensitive manner so as to restrict their impact on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers as far as possible.
15. The proposal would therefore accord with Policy DMHD1 of the DMP in this regard which amongst other things requires that extensions will be required to ensure that a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved and that there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

Conditions

16. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three-year time limit. Matching materials are required in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. It is necessary that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR