
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2019

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 June 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3226279

39 Ferndown, Northwood, HA6 1PH

- 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 H Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 62674/APP/2018/3880, dated 1 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 26 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side and part two-storey 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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an originally semi-detached, two-storey dwelling located within a residential area comprising mostly properties of similar age and form, but with some variety to their original design. Neighbouring properties Nos 37 and 39 have both been extended to the side with two-storey flat roof extensions that are physically linked. Despite this, and the 'terrace effect' that has been created, the original appearance and character of both properties has been largely retained by the significantly recessed positions of the side extensions. This provides an appropriate visual separation between the main bulk of the buildings, which is in harmony with the development pattern more generally along Ferndown. Although of no particular architectural merit, neither extension has significantly impacted upon the wider street scene other than mostly from views directly in front of the appeal site.
4. The proposal would include replacing the existing side extension with one more traditionally built in terms of siting and form, with a hipped roof over and projecting rearwards at two-storey. The two-storey side extension would be recessed behind the dwelling's front elevation by 1.5m, with a subservient ridge

line and a single-storey lean-to element to the front. Although this arrangement would not strictly conform to the Council's guidelines within the *Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document - Residential Extensions* (2008) for side extensions, being flush with the front elevation at ground floor level, the result would be a side addition that would appear appropriately sub-ordinate and reasonably well-integrated with the main dwelling. Nevertheless, it would extend right up to the common side boundary with No 37. This would further conflict with the HDAS and specifically Policy BE22 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), which both require all residential extensions of two or more storeys in height to be set back a minimum of 1m from the side boundary of the property in order to protect the character and appearance of the street scene and to protect the gaps between properties.

5. I am mindful of the current arrangement, which obviously conflicts with the HDAS and development plan policy. However, the deeply recessed position of the existing extension, and its marriage with a similar extension at No 37, compensates to a large extent for its failings. In contrast, the proposed extension would stand alone and would be far more prominent within the street scene. The spatial setting between Nos 37 and 39 would be noticeably changed, with the more widely perceived gap between both significantly eroded. My overall impression is that the development to the side of No 39 would result in a dwelling out-of-keeping with the spacing of properties within the street scene and uncomfortably related to the position and form of No 37. In addition to the conflict with Policy BE22 it would also be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Local Plan: Part Two Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 insofar as they all relate to the quality of design and the need for new development to complement and harmonise with the existing local context.
6. The appellant has argued that this type of extension is commonplace within the borough. However, I have considered the appeal proposal based on the specific merits of the case and the context of the immediate surroundings. I saw nothing along Ferndown that was equivalent either in terms of form or impact.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR