
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2021

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/21/3278671

81 Northwood Way, Northwood HA6 1RT

- 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 & Mrs S Racherla against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 76168/APP/2021/976, dated 12 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is front, side and rear extensions including roof extension to provide first floor habitable space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposal has been altered from the application form to the decision notice. That on the application form adequately describes the proposals and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The first main issue is the effect of the single storey side extension on the character and appearance of the area. The second is the effect of the extensions on the living conditions of the occupiers of 83 Northwood Way (No.83) with particular regard to light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a residential bungalow on a corner plot, which fronts Northwood Way, with Hillside Rise running to its side. It falls within the Hillside, Northwood Area of Special Local Character (ASLC).
 5. The part of the ASLC within which the site is located has a largely open character as a result of the close proximity of the Hogs Back open space, the proliferation of bungalows and the often-low front boundary treatment.
 6. Although not set as far back as the building lines of the front of the properties on Hillside Rise, the setbacks evident on the side elevations of the appeal property and 79 Northwood Way from Hillside Rise contribute to this sense of openness and assist in allowing views up Hillside Rise from Northwood Way.
-

7. The evidence indicates that the projection of the extension to the side of the appeal property would leave just 1m separation to the Hillside Rise footway. This would afford the property a rather cramped appearance on the plot.
8. The extension would not be a discrete addition given its significant bulk and overall height which would tie in with an increase in the ridgeline of the roof in association with the wider development of the dwelling. It would therefore be prominent in views from both Northwood Way and Hillside Rise, despite the presence of boundary treatment in the form of hedging and timber fencing.
9. As a result of the above matters, I therefore conclude that the single storey side extension would compromise the characteristics of the ASLC and would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area.
10. This aspect of the proposal would therefore fail to accord with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 Strategic Policies (2012), policies DMHB 5, DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) (DMP) and Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021) (LP). Amongst other things these policies seek well designed development which enhances and protects local distinctiveness and character and require development which reflects the character of the area and its original layout while taking into account established street patterns.
11. I have not identified conflict with Policy D6 of the LP in relation to this aspect of the proposal as it is primarily concerned with housing quality and standards.

Living conditions

12. The evidence indicates that there is a ground floor bedroom window within the rear elevation of No.83 on its northern side. However, the levels of outlook available and light received already appear compromised to a large degree by a single storey extension at that property which sits immediately adjacent to it, as well as the presence of robust boundary treatment.
13. Further, the window maintains a gap to the northern side elevation of No.83 and both that property and the appeal site are set in from the shared boundary. There would therefore remain a reasonable degree of separation between the properties. The extension at the appeal site would also be set to the north of No.83.
14. Subsequently, I therefore conclude that it would be unlikely that levels of outlook or light would be significantly compromised as a result of the proposal. I have therefore identified no conflict in relation to this matter with policies DMHD1 nor DMHB 11 of the DMP which amongst other things require that proposals do not adversely impact on amenity or result in unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

Other Matters

15. The appellant has suggested an alternative scheme which would involve only providing the side extension as an alternative. However, even if it were reasonable to accept the revisions, such a scheme would not in any event secure advancement for the appeal given the concerns that I have raised.

Conclusion

16. Material considerations do not indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR