



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/W/20/3251401 32 Townsend Way, Northwood HA6 1TF

- 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 Hemal Shah against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 55222/APP/2019/2989, dated 9 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and conversion of single dwelling into 1 x 2-bed and 1 x 3-bed self-contained flats with associated parking and amenity space.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the Council's decision notice and the appeal form as it is more precise than the description on the planning application form.
3. In January 2020, the Council adopted the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies (DMP). The policies within this document replace the policies within the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two 2012, including Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 which were referred to in the Council's reason for refusal. Newly adopted Policies DMHB11 and DMHD1 of the DMP were referred to in the original decision notice and have been provided as part of this appeal. The appellant has therefore had the opportunity to comment.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area including the host building.

Reasons

5. No.32 Townsend Way (No.32) is a two-storey semi-detached house occupying a prominent corner plot on the southern side of Townsend Way. The area has an established residential character and houses on Townsend Way are predominantly semi-detached of a similar style, albeit a number have been extended to the side.

6. The appeal proposal is similar to an approved scheme for the demolition of an existing garage and the construction of a two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension and the conversion to form 2 flats. I saw on my site visit that the approved scheme has been implemented and construction of the two-storey extension is largely complete. The appeal proposal includes an additional single storey side extension to provide an ensuite shower room to the ground floor flat.
7. The single storey extension measures around 1.5m in width, with a pitched roof of around 3.55m in height. Its ridge would broadly align with the bottom cill of the first floor window of the two-storey extension. In isolation the single storey extension is modest. However, I saw on my site visit that the two-storey extension previously found acceptable by the Council is already a significant addition to the original house. In combination, the extensions would be almost as wide as the original house and whilst the symmetry has already been lost, the proposal would completely unbalance the appearance of the semi-detached pair.
8. The single storey extension has been set back from the front elevation of the house, which would be staggered from the original to visually distinguish the extensions. Despite this, the extension would be clearly visible from Townsend Road due both to its prominent corner location and wide frontage, needed to accommodate three parking spaces. Its combined scale means No.32 would appear disproportionately large in relation to the original house and to its neighbour and would be an incongruous addition within the street scene.
9. I note that the scheme previously found acceptable by the Council included a bicycle store in a similar location to the proposed single storey extension. I do not have full details of the bicycle storage before me, but the approved drawing I have seen (11-P5-6) shows a smaller structure, both in width and height. I do not find this comparable to the single storey extension now proposed.
10. I find the proposals would cause harm to the character and appearance of both the host house and wider street scene. It would therefore conflict with part A) i) of Policy DMHB11 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies (2020) (DMP) which requires development to harmonise with its local context. It would conflict with Policy DMHD1 of the DMP which, amongst other things, requires extensions to appear subordinate to the main dwelling and to not have an adverse cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the existing street scene. The proposal would also conflict with the local distinctiveness criteria of Policy BE1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 – Strategic Policies (2012).

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, and taking all other matters into account, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR