



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 April 2025

by **John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/25/3359855

5 Hallowell Road, Northwood, Hillingdon, HA6 1DR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Chris and Lori Heywood against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 16597/APP/2024/2780.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a replacement front porch and two-storey rear/side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host property and wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached, two-storey dwelling with a narrow, gabled frontage and hipped roof to the rear with a centrally positioned and subservient two-storey outrigger which includes a single-storey lean-to further projection. It occupies a corner plot with a side return boundary to Ashurst Close and lies on the fringes of a predominantly residential area comprising a mix of property types, styles, and ages. The proposal would replace and occupy the footprint of the existing two/single-storey rear projection with a two-storey extension to an equivalent depth but which would also project sideways, almost 2m beyond the dwelling's existing side elevation and up to the plot's slightly angled side boundary at a pinch-point. The proposal also includes a new, gable-fronted front porch.
4. The Council has no objection to the proposed front porch. I agree that it would appear as a well-proportioned and modest addition that would be sympathetic to the existing dwelling.
5. When viewed from Hallowell Road, head-on, the two-storey extension would be seen projecting sideways and perceived as a modest and subservient wing. However, this would mask the true scale and form of the proposed addition, which would be considerably more evident when viewed to the side and rear, including at very close quarters, from the public domain along Ashurst Close.

6. Although subservient in height, whether the side/rear extension when taken as a whole would be subordinate in relation to the existing dwelling is moot, but in my view it would become a significant and dominant part of the existing dwelling when seen from the rear, where the building's original form would be largely subsumed and lost. When seen from the side, the addition would add considerable bulk beyond the dwelling's main rear wall. Moreover, although not necessarily complex, I find the extension's combination of a cropped roof, flat crown, and its medley of hips and gables would appear poorly concocted, showing little respect for the simple architectural composition of the original dwelling and with a poor marriage between the old and the new. The incongruous form of the proposed two-storey side/rear extension would be exaggerated further by the dwelling's open and exposed corner location.
7. Due to the wide grass verge between the plot's side boundary and the pavement along Ashurst Close, I am not persuaded that the lack of any meaningful set-back would specifically render the side extension awkward. I also accept that the plot is deep enough to accommodate the depth of the rear extension without it appearing cramped or creating any sense of overdevelopment. However, for the reasons I have given above, due to its size and appearance I find that the proposed two-storey side/rear extension would fail to harmonise with the existing dwelling. This would be harmful to the character and appearance of No 5 and in turn the wider street scene.
8. By failing to respect the design of the original house there would be clear conflict with Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies (DMP), adopted in 2020, which specifically deals with alterations and extensions to dwellings. There would also be conflict with DMP Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12, as well as Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies, adopted in 2012, as far as between them they seek to ensure new development is of a high standard that respects and harmonises with local context.
9. I understand that the proposal would improve the quality of accommodation within No 5 by adding space and allowing some reconfiguration, however this does not outweigh the harm that I have identified and the conflict with development plan policies.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR