

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 November 2022

by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3301821

93 Pinner Road, Northwood HA6 1QN

- 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 Narinder Bhatti against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 62501/APP/2022/1311, dated 21 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is Single storey front/side extension; removal of existing pitched roof of rear extension and construction of a part single; part two storey side/rear extension; Increase in height of garage including single storey side/rear extension; re-located first floor side window and replacement rear doors/windows of existing ground floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The housing along this part of the road is characterised by pairs of semi-detached dwellings, many having been altered and extended. The original form of the host property has been altered by, amongst other things, a large box like dormer window and a hip to gable extension.
4. The proposed extension would project out at first floor level on top of a previously approved, and nearly complete, wrap around flat roof ground floor extension. Its hipped roof would overlap the dormer window. It would project out past the first floor side elevation and its resulting width, relative to the width of the original first floor of the host dwelling, would appear excessively wide and out of proportion. Moreover, the projection to the side, with the hipped roof wrapping around the side wall and under the projecting dormer, would appear a contrived feature.
5. The proposed materials and windows, roof pitch and eaves height would all harmonise with the host dwelling. However, they would not be sufficient to bind the proposed form, width and layout of the proposed extension with the original host dwelling and its subsequent ground floor and dormer alterations. The juxtaposition of the proposal between these elements would jar injuriously in the street scene and in views to the rear. Even though the views of the rear

are confined to private views, cumulative and incremental localised changes of this kind can still erode the character and quality of an area.

6. I accept that the balance has already been lost between the host property and the attached dwelling. However, this does not outweigh my concerns regarding the effects on the character and appearance of the proposal on the host dwelling.
7. My attention has been drawn to other properties in the area that have already been extended in a similar manner to the proposal before me. I saw that these are very much in the minority, and I do not know the circumstances of those cases or the policies that applied at the time of their consideration. In any event, those that I saw served to confirm that such first floor wrap around extensions do appear incongruous features, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the respective host dwellings.
8. I have been provided details of an extension approved at No 62 West End Road (No 62). Although there are some similarities, the extension at No 62 does not appear as wide as the proposal before me in relation to the width of the rear façade. Moreover, it incorporates a distinct two storey side extension with a distinct gable, which positively responds to the design of the host dwelling from the street scene. This has the benefit of ensuring that the large bulky dormer is off set from the side elevation and it does not, as a result, share the same excessive width, and awkward wrap around arrangement, as the proposal before me. As such, the circumstances that applied at No 62 are not directly comparable to those before me.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore conflict with the requirements of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policies D1 and D4 of the London Plan (2021), insofar as they are relevant to this main issue. These say, amongst other things, that planning applications relating to alterations and extensions of dwellings will be required to ensure that there is no adverse cumulative impact of the proposal on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area.
10. I have been referred to paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). However, the paragraph quoted was from an earlier version of the Framework, which has been superseded by the 2021 version and the wording has not been carried through. Instead, the 2021 Framework affirms in paragraph 134, that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents which use visual tools such as design guides and codes. In this regard, given my findings in relation to the design, and the conflict with relevant development plan policies, the proposal would also conflict with the provisions of the Framework.
11. I recognise that extending the property might meet the appellant's need for increased accommodation, would help renovate the property and be built to modern standards. However, these are not considerations that outweigh the harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the area from the scheme before me. The absence of harm in relation to other considerations

are neutral matters that weigh neither for nor against the proposal. Moreover, the compliance with some aspects of the development plan, do not outweigh the conflict with the policies that I have identified.

12. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict.

13. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR