

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2022

by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3298539

13 Foxdell, Northwood HA6 2BU

- 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 Bodtke against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 72654/APP/2021/3320, dated 1 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of a part single, part two storey side extension, part garage extension, removal and replacement of existing hipped roof with new hipped crown roof. 1 rear dormer window, 3 front roof lights, 1 side rooflight and new external openings to ground and first floors.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a part single, part two storey side extension, part garage extension, removal and replacement of existing hipped roof with new hipped crown roof. 1 rear dormer window, 3 front roof lights, 1 side rooflight and new external openings to ground and first floors at 13 Foxdell, Northwood HA6 2BU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 72654/APP/2021/3320, dated 1 September 2021, 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: Dwg No: 1091-P-1; and 1091-P-2A.
 - 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a large, detached dwelling located at the end of a cul-de-sac in a suburban environment. On the south side of the street, there are five properties (including the appeal dwelling). The adjacent dwelling (No 11) has a gabled pitched roof. No 9 and 7 Foxdell are notably larger dwellings with various roof forms including hipped, crown elements and gable front projections. No 5 Foxdell (No 5) appears to be a similar type of property to the appeal dwelling and sits at the other end of the cul-de-sac. It has been altered with a two-storey side extension that is flush with the front building line, with a

hipped crown roof. Overall, there is no strict pattern to the design of houses in the cul-de-sac, although there are similar themes, such as materials and generally being large properties.

4. The proposed two-storey side extension would sit flush with the existing front elevation. However, at approximately 1.4m wide it would be very narrow. As such, it would not appear as a disproportionate addition to the side. With matching materials, I am satisfied that it would be able to harmonise with the host dwelling, in a similar way to the extension at No 5.
5. The new roof would maintain the broad appearance of the hipped roof from the front, but it would encapsulate a crown roof with a false ridge. This would be seen in angled views from the street. However, as outlined previously, there are other examples of crown roofs nearby. Even though there are differences in their sizes, they did not detract from the appearance of those houses, irrespective of frontage planting. Moreover, with it being positioned adjacent to the large gabled roof of No 11, the proposal would not appear unduly bulky.
6. Due to the narrow width and low height of the proposed ground floor side extension, it would appear subordinate to the host dwelling. The detailing of the rear patio windows spanning between the main two storey part of the dwelling and the ground floor side extension would create an awkward arrangement. However, at the ground floor to the rear I do not consider this to be so unacceptably harmful that it would warrant withholding consent. Moreover, the other alterations to the windows, including the single dormer and roof lights on the roof slope would not appear out of character in this suburban residential area.
7. I understand that a previous application was refused and dismissed at appeal. However, the schemes are fundamentally different in their form and appearance. As such, I have assessed the proposal on its own merits.
8. To conclude, the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. I therefore find no conflict with the provisions of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) or paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) when read as a whole. These stipulate, amongst other things, that alterations and extensions of dwellings will be required to ensure that there is no adverse cumulative impact of the proposal on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area.
9. In addition to the standard implementation condition, it is necessary in the interests of precision, to define the plans with which the scheme should accord to those submitted with the application. A condition concerning external materials is required in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
10. For the above reasons, the appeal is allowed subject to conditions.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR