
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2015

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 15 July 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/15/3013886

23 Dene Road, Northwood, Middlesex HA6 2BX

- 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 and Mrs Jayant Sanghrajka against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 70478/APP/2014/4267, dated 27 November 2014, was refused by notice dated 28 January 2015.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side/rear extension, a single storey rear extension, conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include 3 rear rooflights, conversion of integral garage to habitable use involving alterations to front elevation, attached garage to side and installation of basement to be used as a store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for a two storey side/rear extension, a single storey rear extension, conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include 3 rear rooflights, conversion of integral garage to habitable use involving alterations to front elevation, attached garage to side and installation of basement to be used as a store at 23 Dene Road, Northwood, Middlesex HA6 2BX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 70478/APP/2014/4267, dated 27 November 2014, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PA-01; PA-02; PA-03; PA-04; PA-05; PA-06; PA-07; PA-08 Rev A; PA-09 and PA-10.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. Some alterations works have already been undertaken to the appeal property which do not fully accord with the submitted drawings. In determining this appeal I have had regard to the submitted drawings which were considered by the Council.
-

Main Issue

3. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The property is a 2-storey detached dwelling which is situated within a predominately residential area that is identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Saved UDP Policies (LPP2) as forming part of the Dene Road, Northwood Area of Special Local Character (ASLC). An ASLC is an area where the Council seeks to preserve certain elements of character and identity albeit these have not been specifically identified. Policy HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (LPP1) seeks to conserve the distinct and varied environment of different parts of the Borough, including ASLCs.
5. Based upon my site visit, the ASLC generally comprises a mix of dwelling types and styles but they share similar characteristics in terms of being larger dwellings sited to the rear of grass verges and spacious front gardens. During the site visit it was noted that some of the dwellings are sited close together and some rear gardens were not particularly large. There are examples of single storey garages being sited closest to the shared boundaries with wider gaps between the neighbouring properties at first floor level.
6. LPP2 Policy BE1 requires development to harmonise with the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the property, including reflecting the symmetry of the existing building. As indicated on the existing drawings, the original property did not possess a particularly strong symmetrical appearance. The hedge referred to by the Council situated adjacent to the shared boundary with 2 Foxdell did not exist at the time of the site visit.
7. The proposed development includes a 2-storey side extension which would enlarge the width of the existing 2-storey side addition and extend the full depth of the main part of the property. When viewed from the road it is the increase in the width rather than depth of the original property which would be most noticeable.
8. At its current widest point, the Council estimate the overall increase in the width of the 2-storey part of the property would be about 1.65 metres. However, the proposed flank wall would be sited away from the shared boundary with 2 Foxdell and this gap would accord with the guidance of the Council's *Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions* (HDAS) concerning the siting of residential extensions.
9. The proposed 2-storey extension's roof would possess a lower ridge height than the main part of the property reflecting the existing situation for the side addition. As noted by the Council, the proposed 2-storey extension would include a crown roof and the HDAS identifies that extensions should follow the form of the original roof. However, the proposed crown roof would not be particularly noticeable because of the property being set well back from Dene Road. The lack of visual prominence of the crown roof would be assisted by its limited size and the visual dominance of the remainder of the form.

10. I am mindful that the HDAS cannot contain guidance for all circumstances and, for the reasons given, the proposed roof design would not cause adverse harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area within which there is a wide variety of roof designs, including extensive areas of flat roofs. For similar reasons, the crown roof of the proposed single storey rear extension would not cause adverse harm.
11. I acknowledge that the proposed 2-storey extension would add to the scale and bulk of the property when viewed from the road. However, the proposed extension, and the alterations to the existing garage, would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene along the road. This lack of unacceptable harm is because: the design of the appeal scheme would be in keeping with the existing property; the proposed roof would be subservient to the main part of the property; there would be a wide gap retained between the first floor elements of the enlarged property and 2 Foxdell; the increase in the width of the 2-storey element of the property would not be particularly noticeable when viewed from the road and the extent of the spacious front garden would be unaffected.
12. The Council acknowledge that the internal dimensions of the proposed single storey garage would accord with the HDAS guidance. The siting of the proposed side elevation, some 1 metre away from the shared boundary, would also satisfy the HDAS guidelines. The HDAS guidelines also indicate that outbuildings should not exceed 3.4 metres in height and, when viewed from the road, the proposed garage would respect this guidance.
13. The proposed garage would extend the width of the enlarged property's frontage at ground floor level. However, the siting of the proposed garage and width of the enlarged property would be consistent with other dwellings fronting Dene Road. As I have already noted, there would remain a 1 metre gap between the garage's flank wall and the shared boundary with a wider gap at first floor level which would avoid the appearance of a cramped form of development. Overall, the enlarged dwelling would harmonise with the character and appearance of other dwellings within the ASLC and would neither be an unduly visually intrusive nor an incongruous form of development within the streetscene.
14. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would not conflict with LPP1 Policies BE1 and HE1 and LPP2 Policies BE5, BE13, BE15 and BE19 and the aims of the HDAS. In addition to conserving ASLCs, these policies are also concerned with development, including extensions, being of high quality design which complements the character of an area and harmonises with both the existing streetscene and the original property. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) core principle of securing high quality design.

Conditions

15. The Council has suggested a number of conditions in the event that this appeal succeeds and they have been considered against the tests in the Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance. In my judgement, it is necessary

and appropriate for the extensions and the garage to be constructed in matching materials and, for reasons of proper planning, the proposed development should be erected in accordance with the submitted drawings.

16. The Council has suggested a condition requiring the submission of a landscaping scheme but I do not consider that such a scheme is necessary because the proposed development is concerned with alterations to appeal property which do not physically encroach into the front garden. Accordingly, and taking into account all other matters including the Framework's presumption in favour of sustainable development, it is concluded that this appeal should succeed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR