



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 30 September 2021

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3280596

9 Kewferry Drive, Northwood, HA6 2NT

- 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 Pankaj Patel against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 32794/APP/2021/1450, dated 10 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey rear extension, conversion of garage to habitable use, front porch, alterations to the roof, first floor wraparound balcony and alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - i. The character and appearance of the area, including the appeal property
 - ii. The living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, with particular regards to the privacy of the occupiers of 7 and 11 Kewferry Drive

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Kewferry Drive is notable for large, detached, residential dwellings which have a commonality in scale but are of individual designs. This results in a highly varied street scene with no singular property style or pallet of materials and consequently a very mixed appearance. The appeal property is a large, detached dwelling, notably shallower than many others in the area but has been previously extended, in particular to the rear with a single storey outrigger projecting some 6metres along the boundary with No.11.
4. The submitted plans show that the proposed development is of considerable scale of itself and in respect of the already large existing appeal property. As a result of the significant extension enveloping the rear of the property, including the balcony, the crown roof is necessarily large and bulky and as a result would fail to respect the architectural character of the existing dwelling. In combination, these extensions would subsume the original dwelling fundamentally altering the character and appearance of the property.

5. I saw at the site visit that because the bulk of the proposed development would be to the rear of the appeal property it would not be widely visible from the street, nonetheless the proposed extension would be visible from some vantage points and therefore the harm I identified previously would also apply in respect to the wider area.
6. The appellants have drawn my attention to the use of crown roofs elsewhere in the area and I noted these at my site visit, I am not aware of all of the policies and circumstances that applied when these developments were granted planning permission. In assessing the existing character of the area, I have acknowledged the varied appearance of dwellings in the area.
7. Nonetheless, as a result of the significant scale of the proposed extensions and the resulting bulky roof design I find that the appeal scheme would harm the character and appearance of the area, including the appeal property contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 which requires new development to achieve a high quality of design in all new buildings, Policy DMHB 11 and Policy DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 – Development Management Policies that, amongst other matters, requires proposals to harmonise with local context taking into account adjacent structures, established street patterns, building lines and architectural composition and be well integrated with the surrounding area.

Living conditions

8. The submitted plans show a balcony area to the first floor of the rear elevation of the appeal property. The balcony is shown as being a relatively small area, being a little over 1m deep. The appellant states that the flat roof to the western boundary of the site is not to be provided as a balcony and no access from the first-floor bedrooms will be provided.
9. I note that the submitted plan 'South Elevation' shows railings extending the depth of the flat roofed extension, though without an obvious point of access. Nonetheless, the submitted plans show that the western and eastern sides of the proposed balcony would be open, allowing views directly towards the neighbouring properties.
10. I saw at the site visit that there is mature landscaping to the boundaries with the neighbouring properties and that the views from the proposed balcony would views principally be of the private garden space of the appeal property.
11. Nonetheless the balcony would provide views directly towards the neighbouring properties in an elevated position and despite the landscaping to the boundary, would result in a loss of privacy and introduce a sense of being overlooked for the occupiers of Nos 7 and 11.
12. For these reasons I find that the appeal scheme would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, with particular regards to the privacy of the occupiers of 7 and 11 Kewferry Drive contrary to Policies DMHB11 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part Two that, amongst other matters, seek development of good design that sites within the context of neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

13. I note that the appellant has proactively revised the scheme following feedback to pre-application discussions and sought to respond to the Council's concerns. Nonetheless I have determined the application on the basis of the evidence before me.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mr M Brooker

INSPECTOR

