



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2020

by R.Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3253910

15 Hillside Crescent, Northwood HA6 1RP

- 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 Ajay Nair against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 63054/APP/2020/212, dated 22 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front/side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front/side extension at 15 Hillside Crescent, Northwood HA6 1RP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 63054/APP/2020/212, dated 22 January 2020, and the plans submitted with it, 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; 4347/01; and 4347/02.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host bungalow and the Hillside, Northwood Hills Area of Special Local Character.

Reasons

3. No.15 Hillside Crescent (No. 15) is a detached chalet bungalow situated on the south eastern side of Hillside Crescent. It is within the Hillside, Northwood Hills Area of Special Local Character (ASLC). Hillside Crescent is characterised by detached bungalows and chalet bungalows. These vary in style, but there is an overall homogeneity and rhythm to the street scene with similar plan and roof forms, including projecting wings, and bay windows.
4. The front door of No.15 is located on a chamfered corner between a projecting wing and the main bungalow. The proposal would extend the existing flat

roofed garage which, with the projecting bay, forms the bungalows U-shaped form. To the front, the extension would be set just behind the bay window of the projecting wing. It does not extend beyond the front building line of its neighbour at No.13 Hillside Crescent. The proposed extension is quite narrow in plan form, around half the width of the existing wing and because of this modest scale, would appear subordinate to the original bungalow.

5. The roof above the extension would be hipped to match the slope of the main roof. This simple design would unify the roof forms of the bungalow, replacing the unsympathetic flat roof to the garage. A flat roof form is not, I found, a positive or defining characteristic of Hillside Crescent. The eaves of the proposed roof would align with the existing, but because the overall height would be much lower, the projecting wing with its characteristic bay would remain the most dominant visual feature.
6. By projecting further forward than the garage, the proposed extension would emphasise the U-shape plan of the bungalow. However, I saw from my site visit that there are examples on Hillside Crescent, including the neighbouring bungalow at No.13, of forward projections with hipped or gable roof forms that also emphasise the U-shape. The extension would not therefore harm the overall homogeneity that is a characteristic of the area or be incongruous in the street scene.
7. Overall, I find the proposed extension would be a modest addition that respects the character of the host bungalow and the Hillside, Northwood Hills ASLC. I therefore conclude it would accord with Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part One – Strategic Policies (adopted November 2012) which state that new development should achieve a high quality of design and that the Council will seek to conserve and enhance the environment, including locally recognised features such as ASLCs. It would further accord with Policies DMHB1, DMHB11 and DMHB12 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies (adopted January 2020) (DMP) which require development to integrate well with its surroundings, harmonise with its local context and positively contribute to local character and distinctiveness.
8. I also find the proposal would accord with DMP policies DMHB5 and DMHD1 which, amongst other things, require extensions in ASLCs to be subservient, respect the architectural style of the original building and not dominate the street scene. Finally, it would accord with the design and heritage policies of the London Plan (2016) and National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions and conclusion

9. I have imposed conditions controlling the commencement of the works and the details of the approved plans in the interests of certainty. I have also required that the materials match those existing to ensure the extension would have a satisfactory appearance.
10. For the reasons set out above, and taking all other matters into account, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR