

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 October 2016

by Roy Merrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3155901

15 Perry Close, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB8 3HR

- 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 & Mrs Lee Stevens against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 40725/APP/2016/1145, dated 9 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion, change from hipped end roof into gable end roof and two velux windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion, change from hipped end roof into gable end roof and two velux windows at 15 Perry Close, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB8 3HR in accordance with the application Ref 40725/APP/2016/1145, dated 9 March 2016 and 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: 15PC/2
 - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the original dwelling and wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a small bungalow at the end of a short cul de sac of mainly two storey dwellings. Situated within a corner location, the bungalow has a restricted frontage. However the limited height of the dwelling helps to ensure that the plot does not appear over-developed.
-

4. Furthermore whilst not identical in appearance, the adjacent bungalow at No 16 is similar in scale, form and massing to the appeal bungalow. This affinity between the two properties gives a sense of spaciousness and character to what is otherwise a tightly developed corner of the street.
5. The proposed hip to gable extension, would be limited in scale and would not significantly alter the form and mass of the bungalow. The existing footprint of the building would remain unaltered. The proposal would not therefore result in any significant harm to the sense of spaciousness around this corner of the cul de sac, to the visual harmony with the adjacent bungalow at No 16 or to the architectural integrity of the main dwelling itself. The retention of a smaller hipped roof above the forward projecting bedroom would serve to soften the visual impact of the front gable and because of its difference in scale would complement rather than unbalance the proportions of the roof.
6. The dwellings in Perry Close predominantly have hipped roofs. Whilst the hipped roof over the main part of the bungalow would be lost, there have been similar hip to gable extensions elsewhere in the cul de sac, perhaps most significantly to the adjacent dwelling at No 14. The proposal would not therefore interrupt any strong sense of uniformity in design around the street.
7. The Council has drawn my attention to a previous proposed extension to the property which was the subject of an appeal but which was found to be unacceptable by the appeal Inspector (Ref APP/R5510/D/15/3132511) at that time. However, I note that the appeal in question related to a larger development that included an extension to the ground floor area and the incorporation of dormer windows in the roof. Compared with the present appeal, that proposal was therefore larger in scale and would have resulted in greater variation between the existing and proposed developments. The previous appeal decision does not therefore naturally lead to the conclusion that the revised proposal would be unacceptable which I have assessed on its own merits.
8. For the above reasons I conclude that the development would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the original dwelling and wider area. It would not therefore be in conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part One Strategic Policies 2012, Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies 2012 and the Council's Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions 2008 insofar as they seek to promote good design that harmonises with its surroundings.

Conditions and Conclusion

9. For the above reasons I conclude that the appeal should succeed and planning permission be granted.
10. Conditions specifying the plans and requiring details to be agreed of the materials to be used in the external surfaces of the extension are needed to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Roy Merrett

INSPECTOR