



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2020

by R Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3250793
27 Eastbury Road, Northwood HA6 3AJ

- 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 T Shah against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 75352/APP/2020/183, dated 15 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'a two storey front extension, part two storey part single storey rear extension, conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 3 x side dormers and 3 x roof lights and conversion of garage to habitable use.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to 3 x side dormers. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to a two storey front extension, part two storey part single storey rear extension, conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 3 x roof lights and conversion of garage to habitable use and planning permission is granted for a two storey front extension, part two storey part single storey rear extension, conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 3 x roof lights and conversion of garage to habitable use at 27 Eastbury Road, Northwood HA6 3AJ in accordance with the terms of application, Ref 75352/APP/2020/183, dated 15 January 2020, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan A871-1.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant has produced an amended drawing which they suggest would go part of the way towards addressing the reasons for refusal. The Procedural Guide to Planning Appeals – England states that the appeal process should not be used to evolve proposals and is clear that revisions intended to overcome reasons for refusal should normally be tested through a fresh planning application. Having had regard to the Wheatcroft principles, the interests of

fairness, and the clarity of the effects of the revision, I have made my decision based on the original drawings before the Council.

3. For the reasons that follow, I find the proposals acceptable save for the 3 x side dormers. As these are clearly severable both physically and functionally from the remainder of the proposals, I intend to issue a split decision in this case.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the street scene and Northwood Frithwood Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. No.27 Eastbury Road is within the Northwood Frithwood Conservation Area (CA). I am therefore required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the CA, in accordance with the statutory duty as set out in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
6. The significance of the CA is largely derived from its large, individually designed detached houses in the Arts and Craft style with landscaped gardens and tree lined streets. The appeal house is a modern, detached mid-20th Century house located on a street characterised in part by the Arts and Craft houses significant in the CA, but also more recent infill development of differing styles.
7. The appeal house has a distinct triangular roof form with existing side dormer windows set low on the roof slope and back from the front elevation. The location of the proposed dormers directly above those existing would result in an awkward roof composition with a two-tiered appearance. Although set back from the front elevation, they would be high on the roof and clearly visible from Eastbury Road even above the trees on the boundary. As a result, I find the proposed dormers would dominate the simple triangular roof appearance therein causing harm to the character and appearance of the street scene and CA.
8. The appeal house is currently 2-storey with its gable fronting Eastbury Road. The proposed front extension would align with the existing projecting garage bringing the building broadly in line with its neighbour at No.25 Eastbury Road. Although closer to the road, it would remain set well back and the original form and overall appearance would be retained. Importantly, the triangular roof of the original house, which the Council consider distinctive and adds interest to the street scene and CA, would not be lost.
9. The white banding over the converted garage replicates the existing and provides relief and interest to an otherwise brick elevation. Whilst the proposed ground floor windows on the front elevation would not match, they would be of a similar design and proportions and I find these appropriate to the simple architecture of the house. The proposed double front door with open porch would be more prominent than the recessed single front door of the original house. It would, however, be in proportion to the scale of the front elevation and would not overly dominate it. Overall, I find the architectural detailing to the front elevation to be sympathetic to the composition of the house and would not harm its appearance.

10. In conclusion, I find the 3 x side dormers would cause harm to the appearance of the street scene and fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Northwood Frithwood Conservation Area. This conflicts with Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012), and Policies DMHB4 of the Local Plan: Part 2 – Development Management Policies (2020) (DMP). Amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure development does not result in harm to heritage assets and maintains the quality of an area.
11. I am satisfied that the other extensions serve to preserve the character and appearance of the CA and do not conflict with any of the policies listed above. There is also no conflict with DMP Policy DMHD1 because the front extension would not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plan so far as relevant to that part of the development permitted. This is in the interest of certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition requiring the external materials used in the construction of the development to match those of the existing building.

Conclusions

13. For the reasons given above, and taking all other matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed in part and dismissed in part.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR