



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 25 May 2021

by Luke Simpson BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3256761

15 Kewferry Road, Northwood, HA6 2NS

- 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 Anthony Strachan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 26090/APP/2020/300, dated 27 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'retrospective planning for rear extension, roof domelight and front boundary wall'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 'retrospective planning for rear extension, roof domelight and front boundary wall' at 15 Kewferry Road, Northwood, HA6 2NS, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 26090/APP/2020/300, dated 27 January 2020 and the plans submitted with it.

Preliminary Matters

2. The rear extension, front boundary wall and gates have been erected and therefore I am considering this appeal retrospectively.
3. The submitted plan (Ref A110), showing the proposed front boundary wall and gates, differs slightly from the development which has been erected. During my site visit, I noted that the railings include additional detailing including spikes and decorative detailing, which is not shown on the submitted plan. In view of my findings, I consider that the discrepancies between the development applied for and that which has been erected are so minor that they are de minimis in both appearance and context.
4. Representations received by the Council from interested parties, during the application stage, refer to the effect of the proposed rear extension on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Therefore, whilst not included within the Council's reason for refusal, I have also considered the effect of this aspect of the development in relation to the main issue of character and appearance.
5. Since the application was determined, the London Plan (2021) has been published and is now part of the development plan. The previous policies of the London Plan (2016) have therefore been replaced. However, in this case, none of the policies in the London Plan (2016) have been referred to in the reason for refusal. I therefore consider that I can rely on the policies of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (Local Plan Part 1) and the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (Local Plan Part 2) and I am

satisfied that the design based policies of the new London Plan (2021) reflect these.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area.

Reasons

7. During my site visit, I noted that Kewferry Road is predominantly characterised by two-storey detached dwellings, which are set back from the road with large front driveways. Front boundary walls and fences typically separate these driveways from the adjacent footway. There is variation in the design of front boundary treatments, both in terms of their scale and the materials utilised. The character is relatively verdant, albeit there are numerous examples where dwellings have little or no planting along their front boundaries.
8. The appeal site comprises a two-storey dwelling, which has a fairly traditional appearance. A single storey extension with a roof domelight, which is part of the appeal development, has been erected to the rear. The front boundary treatment, also part of the appeal development, consists of a red brick wall with metal railings and metal gates which are painted black with minor detailing. Whilst I note that the wall and railings are taller than some of the neighbouring boundary treatments, there are other neighbouring examples which are similar in scale.
9. Although I have noted the predominantly verdant character of the surrounding area, there are properties on Kewferry Road which do not incorporate boundary planting to the front. The variation in appearance, scale and materials of front boundary treatments in the neighbouring area also creates a mixed character. Within this context the appeal development does not stand out as an incongruous feature and assimilates well with the surroundings. The fact that the development comprises two separate gates does not have a visually harmful impact.
10. During my site visit, I noted that the appellant has incorporated some planting to the centre and side of the driveway. This assists in assimilating the development with the host property and surrounding area. Albeit, even in its absence, the development would be in keeping with the character of the surrounding area. Therefore, I do not consider it necessary to impose a condition requiring submission of planting details, nor a condition requiring retention of the existing planting arrangements.
11. In terms of the effect of the development upon the host property itself, the boundary treatment would not appear as out of scale with the host dwelling. The materials used assist in breaking up the appearance of the white rendered front elevation of the property, with the black railings reflecting the black detailing on the front elevation of the host property. The red bricks are similar to those of other front boundary treatments in the surrounding area.
12. The single storey rear extension extends along the whole of the rear elevation of the host property. The extension incorporates a part pitched and part flat roof, with a glazed roof lantern. The height and depth of the extension are considered to be such that the scale of the extension would be subordinate to the host dwelling. Many neighbouring properties also incorporate single storey

rear extensions of a similar scale. Furthermore, the materials used are similar to the host property. Given my findings, I agree with the Council's approach, in that the rear extension as built is in keeping with the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area.

13. For these reasons, I conclude that the development does not have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the appeal site or the surrounding area. The development therefore complies with Local Plan Part 1 Policy BE1 and Local Plan Part 2 Policies DMHD1 and DMHB11, which seek in part to achieve high quality design and ensure that new development is in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The development also complies with Local Plan Part 2 Policy DMHD14, which seeks in part to ensure that developments retain or enhance landscaping, trees and other natural features of merit.
14. Representations have been received from interested parties which raise concerns regarding the effect of a second vehicular access on highway safety. During my site visit I saw that only one gate provides vehicular access to the site, with the other providing pedestrian access to the driveway. The fact that the pedestrian gate may be wide enough for a vehicle is not in itself a reason to consider that vehicles would utilise the access. Furthermore, as the Council have outlined, the previous arrangement included two access points and an application for a second vehicular crossing in this location would be the subject of a separate application to the Highway Authority. I therefore find that there is no harm in terms of highway parking or safety.
15. Claims have also been made, which suggest that the submitted plans do not accurately reflect the rear extension, particularly in terms of its height. During my site visit I did not see any discernible difference between what has been erected and the development shown on the plans. In any case, having reviewed the plans and assessed the development in situ, I have concluded that the rear extension would not have any adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the appeal site or surrounding area.
16. Representations concerning the ability to sell a neighbouring property and damage to a neighbouring property were also raised by third parties. These matters are private interests which can have no bearing on this appeal. Accordingly, I have reached my conclusion on the planning merits and impacts of the development. Building regulations were also referred to but they are governed by a separate regulatory regime.

Conditions

17. I have considered the conditions requested by the Council and the extent to which they accord with the advice contained within the Planning Practice Guidance. A condition listing the approved plans is not necessary, as the development is retrospective and I have found the development, as erected, to be acceptable. A condition requiring the submission and implementation of a soft landscaping scheme is not considered necessary, given that I have concluded that the development would be acceptable without such a scheme. A condition requiring details of materials is not necessary, given that the development has already been erected and I have considered the suitability of the materials in reaching my conclusions.

Conclusion

18. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Luke Simpson

INSPECTOR