
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 June 2021

By K Winnard LL.B Hons Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3269679
13 Foxdell Northwood HA6 2BU

- 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 Christian Bodtke-Monal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref.72654/APP/2020/3132, dated 1 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension, hip to gable roof conversion, insertion of 3 rear facing dormers, 5 front facing roof lights plus high level below apex side window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The development, the subject of the proposal, includes rear facing dormers. The Council has raised no objection to this element of the proposal. I agree with the Council on this issue and accordingly I will deal with the two storey side extension, hip to gable roof conversion, 5 front facing roof lights plus high level below apex side window in my decision.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property (No 13) is located at the end of Foxdell, a short cul-de-sac consisting of large detached dwellings. Some of these dwellings have been subject to extensions and alterations though these have not significantly changed the overall character and appearance of the area. The area retains a well balanced appearance and character of detached properties in a mature setting.
5. Whilst the side extension proposed is modest in itself, the construction of gable walls to enable the proposed roof conversion would result in a sizeable addition to No 13. Together they would appear disproportionate and unsympathetic and add considerably to the bulk and scale of the dwelling. The gable walls would

result in a mass of built form which would be dominant in the street scene. In addition, the introduction of a number of roof lights within an extended roofscape would be an incongruous addition drawing the eye and resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the area when viewed in the context of the cul-de-sac.

6. The appellant's agent has cited three other extensions to properties on Foxdell in support of the proposal. Whilst I observed these properties on site I am not aware of the full circumstances surrounding any of these developments. Although the extension at No 5 Foxdell has increased its size, it still retains a hipped roof which reflects the design of the original dwelling. It is also in a more secluded location with extensive screening on site. As such I do not consider that it significantly detracts from the character and appearance of the area. No 1 Foxdell is of a different design, on a corner plot and on higher ground to the appeal proposal, and as such it does not represent a direct parallel. In any event, the existence of these developments does not justify development which would otherwise be harmful.
7. Particular attention has been drawn to the gable end development at the neighbouring property at No 11 Foxdell, constructed under permitted development allowances. Whilst the introduction of the two gables either side has changed the character of the property it is an isolated example of such development within the street scene and as such does not change the overall character and appearance of the cul-de-sac. Moreover, it differs from the proposal before me in that the two gables were formed from the original property, not as extended. I note also from my site visit that the gable walls have a tile hanging finish which mitigates their impact. I acknowledge that there would be some benefit in ensuring symmetry in roof forms and height between neighbouring properties at this end of the cul-de-sac, but the alterations at No 11 do not diminish the harmful effect on the streetscene that the proposal before me would have. As such the developments to which I have been referred only merit limited weight and do not lead me to a different view in this case.
8. I therefore conclude that the development would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of No 13 and the area. As such the development is contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (November 2012), and Policies DMHD1, DMHD11 and DMHD12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020) which together require development to be of a high quality design to harmonise with the local context, for extensions to appear subordinate to the main dwelling and be well integrated with no adverse cumulative impact on the character of the area. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which requires development to be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matter

9. I note the reference to the Council's handling of Certificate of Lawful Development applications but these are not matters before me or ones which alter my findings.
10. The Council has not objected to the rear dormer element of the proposal, but as this element is not physically or functionally severable, a split decision in

this instance is not appropriate in respect of this particular element of the proposal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given, I hereby dismiss the appeal.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR