
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2017

by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3161235

65 Wood End Green Road, Hayes, Middlesex UB3 2SF

- 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 Parminder Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 30776/APP/2016/2103, dated 27 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as alteration of roof to approved drawings (30776/APP/2016/368) permission granted 05/04/2016.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development above has been taken from the appellant's planning application form. I consider that the description of development on the Council's decision notice more accurately reflects the proposal, particularly given that the extension to which application Ref 30776/APP/2016/368 relates has not been constructed. I have therefore considered the appeal on the basis that the development proposed is a two storey side/rear extension involving raising of the roof.

Background and Main Issue

3. Planning permission was granted for a two storey side/rear extension with pyramid roof design in April 2016. The appellant wishes to change the approved roof design to one with side gable ends.
4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the new roof design on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. No 65 Wood End Green Road is a detached property located within an established residential area. The area is characterised by detached and semi-detached properties of different architectural designs. No 65 has a pyramid roof design, the neighbouring property at No 61 has a projecting front gable, beyond which is a hipped roof; the other neighbouring property at No 67 is semi-detached with the ridge line running parallel to the road and having a side gable feature. The appellant has calculated that the new roof would increase the height of the property by 1 metre.
-

6. Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies (LP) requires new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment. Amongst other matters, high quality design which enhances the local distinctiveness of the area is sought. Saved Policies BE13 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (adopted 1998) Saved Policies (UDP) have similar objectives and require development to harmonise with the existing street scene and compliment or improve the amenity and character of an area. UDP Policy BE15 requires extensions to harmonise with the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the original building.
7. Further guidance on extensions is contained within the Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions (SPD). Paragraph 6.6 of the SPD relates to rear extensions and states that the height of the extension should not normally exceed the height of the existing building. In terms of side extensions, the SPD states that for detached houses, the roof height of the extension should be equal to that of the main house and its design should follow that of the existing roof. It further states that pastiche designs alien to the style of the building should not be used (SPD paragraph 5.9).
8. These policies and guidance broadly accord with the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) core planning principles to secure high quality design and take account of the different roles and character of different areas. Paragraph 56 of the Framework advises that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. It states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.
9. Given that the proposal would change the roof design of the existing dwelling to one with side gables, which would be higher than the existing roof, there would be conflict with UDP Policy BE15 and the guidance on extensions contained within the SPD.
10. However, there is no dispute between the parties that the design of the host property is at odds with the layout, form and design of neighbouring development. The existing roof does not reflect neighbouring development, in terms of its design or height. The appellant has calculated that the ridge height of the hipped element of No 61 is 1000 millimetres higher than the existing roof at No 65, and that the ridge height of No 67 is 300 millimetres higher than No 65. It is submitted that the new roof would be the same height as the hipped element of No 61.
11. I am in no doubt that a side gable roof design would reflect the established character and appearance of the area. However, I am concerned about the resultant height of the proposed roof. It would tower above No 67, and would have a much greater bulk and mass than the roof at No 61. The new roof would be a dominant, prominent feature in the street scene, and this harm would be exacerbated as a result of the close proximity of the extended dwelling to neighbouring properties, which is the context within which it would be viewed.
12. Paragraph 64 of the Framework advises that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. In

light of my findings, I find that the roof design would fail to harmonise with the existing street scene. It would not compliment or improve the amenity and character of the area. This would be in conflict with UDP Policies BE13 and BE19, and LP Policy BE1. The setting back of the front elevation of the dwelling as proposed would not mitigate the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

R C Kirby

INSPECTOR