



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 9 November 2020

by A Parkin BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3257197
231 Joel Street, Northwood HA5 2PJ

- 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 Stuart Adams against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 3169/APP/2018/4164, dated 27 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 14 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'first floor rear extension, roof extension and conversion of existing roof to habitable space, including new front and side facing roof dormers and high level rooflights following partial demolition of existing hipped roof.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In conducting my site visit I also viewed No 231 from the rear garden of No 231A next door, as requested by the Council.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the area; and,
 - the living conditions of nearby occupiers, with particular regard to overdominance.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is located in a predominantly residential area comprising traditional, detached and semi-detached dwellings of various designs and with front and rear gardens. The terrain slopes downwards from north to south in the vicinity of the appeal property, with the dwellings on the eastern side of the road positioned somewhat higher than Joel Street.
5. The appeal building is a 2-storey, 4-bedroomed, detached dwelling, with a largely hipped roof and with a boundary wall and off-street parking to the front. There is a 2-storey bay feature to the front beneath a gable, with a central porch and an integral garage on the northern side of the building. The building

is largely rendered and overall makes a positive contribution to the variety of dwellings to be found along this part of Joel Street.

6. The dwelling spans the full width of the property and has been extended in the past, with separate single storey rear extensions and a flat-roofed, first floor side extension to the rear. The rear garden area is narrow and predominantly lawn, with mature hedges to the sides and some substantial mature trees towards the end.
7. The proposed development would entail substantial alterations to the dwelling, many of which would be visible from the public realm. Given the constraints of the site, most of the alterations would be within the existing building footprint, extending upwards, and particularly towards the rear.
8. A raised crown roof would be constructed, significantly increasing the massing of the roof and changing its profile in views from the front; the gradient of the roof slopes would also be somewhat steeper than existing, including those of the retained gable feature to the front.
9. New rooflights to the front and both sides would be introduced, with a substantial Dutch Gable and a separate dormer window to the rear. The Dutch Gable would be positioned above a first floor extension, which would cover an existing single-storey rear extension, next to the boundary with No 231A.
10. The increased scale and substantially greater massing of the proposed roof would be a disproportionate and over-dominant addition to the appeal building, which would be readily visible from Joel Street. Furthermore, the design of the enlarged roof, including its large crown, steeper pitches and the introduction of rooflights to the front and sides would also be unsympathetic to the host building.
11. The rear Dutch Gable would be a similarly large and incongruous addition to the roofscape, although its position means it would be less prominent in public views. However, it would be visible from parts of the public realm and its design and massing would be out of keeping with the host dwelling.
12. Notwithstanding the sloping topography of the area and the variety of designs of dwellings to be found here, including some with crown roofs, the cumulative impacts of the proposed development would significantly and adversely affect the appearance of the building and would detract from the wider streetscene.
13. For these reasons the proposed development would adversely affect the character and appearance of the area. It would, therefore, conflict with Policy BE1 (Built Environment) of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies November 2012 (HLP1SP) and with Policies DMHB11 (Design of New Development) and DMHD1 (Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings) of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies January 2020 (HLP2DMP) in this regard.
14. Policy DMHB12 (Streets and Public Realm) of the HLP2DMP is not relevant to the appeal development.

Living Conditions

15. The proposed extension to the rear would increase the living space of the appeal dwelling at first floor level, and together with the general enlargement of the roof including the Dutch Gable, within the loft space too. Whilst the

proposed rear extension would not exceed the footprint of the existing single-storey rear extension, which forms the boundary with No 231A, it would increase its height and massing substantially.

16. Separating the principal side elevations of the two dwellings is a space of some 2.3 metres, within the curtilage of No 231A; this space means that the proposal would accord with the '45-degree rule' in terms of outlook from the rear of the next door dwelling¹.
17. No 231 is also located almost directly to the north of No 231A, which means that there would be no significant overshadowing or loss of natural light to the occupiers of No 231A, as a result of the proposal.
18. However, the height, massing and position of the proposed rear extension would make it an overbearing and visually obtrusive feature in the compact rear garden of No 231A. A raised patio area is located next to the property boundary by the existing rear extension, and so beneath the proposed extension, and would be particularly affected.
19. For these reasons, the proposed development would adversely affect the living conditions of nearby occupiers, with particular regard to overdominance and overlooking. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy BE1 of the HLP1SP and with Policies DMHB11 and DMHD1 of the HLP2DMP in this regard.
20. Again, Policy DMHB12 of the HLP2DMP is not relevant to the appeal development.

Other Matters

21. Whilst not a concern of the Council and not addressed by the appellant, a third party has objected to the proposal on the grounds that it would affect the privacy of neighbouring occupiers. The proposed rear extension would introduce two Juliet balconies at first-floor and roof level, some distance from the principal rear elevation of the appeal building.
22. If I was contemplating allowing the appeal, this is a matter that I would need to reflect upon further, given the height and position of the proposed balconies and the narrow plot width. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons there is no need for me to consider this matter further.

Conclusion

23. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Parkin

INSPECTOR

¹ Referenced in Policy DMHD1 of the HLP2DMP – B) vi)