



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2024

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08.05.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3339069

114 Northwood Road, Harefield, Hillingdon, UB9 6PS

- 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 Liam Halpin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 20106/APP/2023/3090, dated 24 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 8 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is extension to existing loft conversion to include hip to gable conversion – installation of rear dormer and two number front roof light windows and front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of extension to existing loft conversion to include hip to gable conversion – installation of rear dormer and two number front roof light windows and front porch at 114 Northwood Road, Harefield, Hillingdon, UB9 6PS, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20106/APP/2023/3090, dated 24 October 2023, and the plans submitted with it, 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 plans: 1:1250 site plan, NORTHWOOD/01, NORTHWOOD/02, NORTHWOOD/03, NORTHWOOD/04.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Main issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 114 Northwood Road is a two storey semi-detached house which has been converted into two flats. Properties along the street are mainly two storey detached and semi-detached houses in a variety of styles, which typically include strong forward gables and bay windows. There is a large school and open grassed area on the opposite side of the road.

4. The relevant policies in this case include policies BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (November 2012) and DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management policies (January 2020) (the local plan). These relate to the design quality of new development, including extensions, which, among other things, should be sympathetic to the host building and harmonise with the local environment. Roof extensions should be located to the rear and subservient to the scale of the existing roof.
5. The proposed extension to the roof space would result in a new gable element replacing the existing hipped roof. It would be over that part of the building which is set back from the main front gable which is shared with the adjoining semi-detached house, No. 116, and which dominates the combined frontage of the building as a whole. Although it would alter the existing composition and symmetry of the building, I consider that it would integrate with the appearance of the building. It would not result in a disproportionate increase in bulk and its scale would be in keeping with the varied house styles along the street. There would be no increase in height above that of the main ridge.
6. I consider that the design of the hip to gable roof is appropriate in the context of the general character of the surrounding area. It would be set back from the main front gable and would not result in an over-large extension. There would be no adverse cumulative effect on the character and appearance of the street scene where there is a variety of roof forms, including a similar example further along the street to the east.
7. The proposed rear dormer, although out of proportion with the existing roof, would be set away from the ridge, eaves and sides of the new roof and in proportion with it. It would exceed two thirds of the width of the original roof but the window glazing would be aligned with that of the first floor windows below. Although overall the dormer would be larger than the guidance in policy DMHD1, it would not be readily visible from public viewpoints and this element alone would not be sufficient to justify dismissing the appeal.
8. I conclude that overall the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the building or the street scene and surrounding area and that in this respect it is consistent with local plan policies BE1, DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1.
9. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council, having regard to the tests set out in the Framework. A condition detailing the plans is necessary to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and for the avoidance of doubt. A condition relating to the materials is necessary in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR