
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2025

by T Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/25/3366678

68 Knoll Crescent, NORTHWOOD, HA6 1HY

- 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 Mrs Geetanjalee Devani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref is 36488/APP/2025/292.
- The development proposed is the conversion of existing dwellinghouse into 2 no. self contained flats.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for an award of costs was made by the appellant. This is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are the standard of the accommodation proposed and the effects on a protected tree.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to this 2 storey, semi-detached house which is located in a residential area. The appeal scheme proposes to convert the existing house by dividing the house into 2 flats, one on each floor. An additional car parking space is proposed within the frontage.
5. The ground floor flat would contain 3 bedrooms. The proposed bedroom 3 would be served by a single window in the side elevation of the building. This window would face onto the narrow space between the flank wall of the house and the high boundary fence. I consider that this would offer a very restricted outlook for this room and would mean that its access to light would be restricted. In my judgement, this would not provide a suitable residential environment for any future occupiers of this flat.
6. The Council also raise concerns that bedroom 2 on the ground floor would have its window very close to the main entrance to the building and close to the adjacent car parking space. In relation to the parking space, I consider that it would be practical to allocate that space to the ground floor flat, if the scheme were to go ahead, and so little unacceptable disturbance would arise. In relation to noise from the entrance, this would only be for the 2 individual properties and in terms of 'external noise' would only be that generated by the upper flat. I would envisage that this would be limited in its effects and not unreasonable.

7. It is not clear if both flats would have access to the rear garden area and on what basis or division. The Council indicates that if the whole area were to be communal, it could give rise to privacy issues for the ground floor flat. Conversely, if the whole area were for the ground floor flat only, then the upper floor would be unacceptably affected. I agree that the lack of certainty means that the proposal could fail to provide a suitable residential environment in this respect and this adds to my objection to the proposal.

8. To conclude on this issue, the proposal would fail to provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation and amenity space, contrary to Policies DMHB 16 and DMHB 18 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (DMP).

9. The frontage of the site contains a tree that is included with a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). The proposed additional car parking space would be sited close to this tree. The tree currently sits within an area which is raised from the adjacent road and pavement and it seems inevitable that the proposed car parking space would need to be excavated to some degree. The appellant's submissions do not include any assessment of what works would be required to provide the parking space nor any assessment of the likely effects of those works on the well-being of the protected tree. Taking account of the proximity of the parking space to the tree, there is a legitimate concern that the well-being of the tree could be affected. In the absence of a suitable assessment, the future health of the tree cannot be ensured. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 Strategic Policies and DMHB 14 of the DMP.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge the appellant's point that the proposal would provide an additional dwelling, making a contribution to the supply of homes in the area. However, this must be balanced against any unacceptable effects that the proposal would bring with it. I judge that the schemes shortcomings would significantly outweigh any benefits. I also accept that it may be the appellant's intention to live in the ground floor flat but it has to be accepted that this may not always be the case and it is no reason to accept the unacceptable consequences of the proposal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

T Wood

INSPECTOR