

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2022

by C McDonagh BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/21/3277068

26 Highland Road, Northwood, London HA6 1JT

- 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 N Kazalbash against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 49247/APP/2021/1060, dated 17 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is the subdivision of the existing dwelling to provide an additional 2-bed unit with associated garden and parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. During the course of the appeal, the revised National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021) (the Framework) was published. I consider that there have been no fundamental changes relevant to the main issue in this appeal and therefore no party will be prejudiced by my consideration of it.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. No.26 Highland Road is a semi-detached dwelling with a two-storey side extension, rear garden and a paved area to the front. The side extension is set back from the front elevation of the host building and extends past the rear elevation. This part of Highland Road comprises a mix of semi-detached and detached dwellings. Generally speaking, properties here display similar plot widths and lengths and are set back a consistent distance from the road. This creates a strong front building line and a pleasant rhythm in the street scene which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. Due to its location on a bend in the road, No.26 has a wider rear garden than most other properties in the street. However, the proposal to sub-divide the plot and the addition of a fence to the rear would cause the resulting two plots to appear narrower than other properties due to the resulting plot forms. This would appear contrived and highlight the incongruity in the street scene.
6. Moreover, the side extension, which would become a separate dwelling, would be set well back from the established front building line of this side of the

street, contrary to the prevailing pattern of development on Highland Road. While this may have aided in the extension appearing subservient to the host dwelling when constructed, as a separate dwelling it would appear incongruous in the street scene. In combination, these effects would cause harm to the character and appearance of the street scene.

7. I take on board the appellant's point that the fence would only be partially visible from the street and that no other works are required to facilitate the sub-division externally. I am also informed the fence would fall under permitted development rights as given in Schedule 2, Part 2, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (the GPDO). Be that as it may, it would be unlikely that a fence would be erected in this manner without the proposal to sub-divide the plot. As such, this limits the weight I afford this fallback position. In any event, the fence is part of the proposal before me, and I have assessed the proposal as it is presented.
8. To conclude, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies (adopted November 2012) and DMHB11 and DMHB12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies (adopted January 2020). These seek, among other things, for development to harmonise with the local context, including building plot sizes and widths, established street patterns and building lines and setbacks.
9. Policy D6 of the London Plan is also quoted on the decision notice. However, D6 relates to housing quality and standards, particularly in relation to internal and external space and other aspects such as daylight and sunlight. From my understanding of the evidence before me, the Council does not take issue with matters such as those included in D6 and as such, the proposal would comply with this policy.

Other Matters

10. The proposal would meet internal and external space standards required by various policies comprising the development plan. This is not disputed by the Council. However, the lack of harm in this regard would be neutral rather than weighing in favour of the proposal.
11. Whilst all new dwellings contribute to housing supply, in this case the delivery of one additional unit would only make a limited contribution. I have nothing definitive before me as to the Council's housing land supply position, although I agree that the delivery of small sites such as this do make a positive contribution. Although worthy of some positive weight, and regardless of whether the site is previously developed, this would be limited and would not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons identified, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C McDonagh

INSPECTOR