

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 October 2016

by Elaine Worthington BA (Hons) MTP MUED MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24th October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3157498

44 Micawber Avenue, Hillingdon, Middlesex, UB8 3NZ

- 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 Paul Sidley against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 51969/APP/2016/984, dated 9 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of flat roof into pitched roof with single bedroom and en suite.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. As the application form is not dated, I have taken the date of the application to be when the plans were received by the Council as indicated in the officer's report.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached bungalow in a residential area. It has a pitched roof with a gable end facing the street. The proposal would see the creation of a pitched roof over the property's existing single storey rear flat roof extension.
 5. The ridge of the proposed roof would be around 1 metre higher than that of the roof of the main dwelling. The eaves would also be raised above those of the original bungalow. Since the single storey rear extension is slightly wider than the main part of the building, the proposed roof would project outwards to the side of the existing roof. The juxtaposition of the eaves and ridge lines of the proposed roof in relation to those of the main dwelling would be evident. Moreover, the proposal would create a blank front facing wall feature that would be set back towards the rear of the house, but seen above and to the side of the bungalow's existing gable end.
-

6. Despite being positioned back from the road frontage, the proposal would appear as a disproportionate and awkward feature that would conflict with the existing form of the dwelling. It would dominate and unbalance the appearance of the bungalow and undermine its existing character. The appeal property's wide side driveway would mean that the proposal would be highly visible in Micawber Avenue and, despite the presence of a variety of roof alterations nearby, it would stand out as an incongruous and unsympathetic addition that would fail to harmonise with the street scene.
7. Planning permission for a first floor rear extension with a pitched roof was previously granted on appeal in 2008. A re-submission of that scheme was approved by the Council in 2011 but has since lapsed. The appellant advises that these permissions have not been implemented due to bad health. I have not been provided with copies of that decision or the plans relating to it. However, the Council advises that the permitted extension was only 300-400 millimetres higher than the ridge of the roof of the main house. The appellant does not provide any information to the contrary. As such, I consider that the scheme before me is more substantial and materially different from that previously approved development.
8. The appellant refers to an example of another roof extension nearby at 182 Harlington Road which was cited in the previous appeal. I am not aware of the full circumstances that led to that development and so I cannot be sure that they are directly comparable with the appeal scheme. I confirm in any event that I have considered the appeal proposal on its individual planning merits.
9. I therefore conclude on this issue that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. This would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies which requires new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment in order to create successful and sustainable neighbourhoods. It would conflict with Policies BE13 and BE15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Saved UDP Policies (Local Plan Part Two) which require the layout and appearance of development to harmonise with the existing street scene and the scale, form architectural composition and proportions of the existing building. It would fail to support Local Plan Part Two Policy BE19 which seeks to ensure that new development in residential areas complements or improves the amenity and character of the area.
10. It would also be at odds with the advice in the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document which indicates that roof alterations should be assessed against any possible detrimental effect to the appearance of the original house and the character of the local area. Furthermore it would undermine the core planning principle of the National Planning Policy Framework to seek to secure high quality design.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elaine Worthington

INSPECTOR