



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 April 2019

by Michael Simmons BSc(Hons) DipTP DipUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 May 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3222256
77 Hillside Road, Northwood HA6 1PZ

- 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 S Shetty against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 8560/APP/2018/1091, dated 22 March 2018, was refused by notice dated 6 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is described as 'single storey front extension including conversion of garage to habitable room and alterations to roof'.
-

This decision is issued in accordance with Section 56(2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and supersedes the decision issued on 1st May 2019.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension including conversion of garage to habitable room and alterations to roof at 77 Hillside Road, Northwood, HA6 1PZ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 8560/APP/2018/1091, dated 22 March 2018, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 3222-06/RM and 3222-07/RM.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the development in the Council's decision notice, 'single storey front extension involving conversion of garage to habitable use and alterations to roof over garage' differs from the description included on the application form. Neither the Council or appellant has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the description given on the original planning application form.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

4. 77 Hillside Road (No 77) is a detached bungalow located within a predominately residential area comprising primarily single storey hipped roofed properties but with many also displaying first floor accommodation within their roofs. The prevalence of single storey properties is a unifying feature of the locality and is a strong contributory factor to the character of the Hillside, Northwood Hills Area of Special Local Character (ASLC). However, there is some variance in the design and form of individual properties.
5. No 77 has a bay protruding forward of the rest of the building. The proposal is to extend forward of the remainder of the building but not so far as the existing protruding bay. The extension would be consistent with the building line of the neighbouring property at No 75 that would be immediately adjacent. Whilst the extended pitched roof would conceal a small flat roofed element, this would not be visually apparent.
6. The appearance of the property would be improved and rationalised by the proposal as it would result in the removal of both the dominant integral garage and a bulky first-floor dormer style feature. The proposal would also replace a somewhat awkward and incongruous extension over the garage and would offer a better-balanced solution. Matching materials would be used and the elevation presented to the street, including a small bay, would be respectful of the existing property with the extension remaining recessed behind the primary protruding bay. The hipped roof would extend across the width of the property but this would not result in an excessively bulky addition. Hipped roofs of varying sizes are a common feature in the street scene and a number of properties have been altered and extended in the area with some properties displaying similar characteristics to the appeal proposal. Accordingly, in this context, the proposal would not appear as a strident or unusual alteration within the street scene and ASLC.
7. Therefore, I conclude that the development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the appeal building or the surrounding area, including the ASLC. Consequently, it would accord with Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE5, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions, which collectively seek to ensure developments' design is of good quality and is respectful of the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Conditions

8. I have considered the planning conditions suggested by the Council in light of the advice in the Planning Policy Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition and in the interest of certainty it is appropriate that there is a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. The approved plans also confirm that matching materials would be used. This will ensure the delivery of a development that respects the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

MA Simmons

INSPECTOR