
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 February 2017

by Christa Masters MA (hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 8th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3167658
48 Pole Hill Road, Uxbridge UB10 0QB

- 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 Syed Hussain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 33924/APP/2016/2241, dated 8 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is proposed roof dormer in roof on one side of rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. The site visit which took place was scheduled as an access required site visit. However, there was no one at the property when I arrived. The property is on a corner plot and is visible from the public highway. As such, the site visit proceeded without the need to access the site.
3. It was evident from the site visit that two dormers have been constructed at the property. This conflicts with the information presented on the existing application drawings before me. The Officers report advises that dormers approved under permitted development have been installed at the site. I have proceeded to determine the appeal based on what I saw on the site visit and the application drawings before me.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property comprises a detached dwelling set within an established residential location. It is located in a relatively prominent position at the junction of Pole Hill Road and Harrow View.
 6. My attention has been drawn to policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (LP) 2012 which states that the Council will require new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment. The policy goes on to note that alterations and extensions should enhance local distinctiveness. In addition, policies BE13 and BE15 of the Unitary
-

Development Plan (UDP) 2007 seek to ensure, amongst other things, that proposals harmonise with the existing street scene as well as the proportions of the original building.

7. The proposed roof dormer would be positioned on the rear flank elevation of the property. I acknowledge that this elevation is the least visible from public vantage points. Nevertheless, as a result of the size and scale of the dormer, it would in my view represent a bulky addition to the property which would dominate this part of the roof. When considered in conjunction with the existing dormers at the property, the proposal presents a bulky and unbalanced feature to the property which would further dominate the roof slope of this modest dwelling. The proposal would in my view fail to respect the original proportions of the building and would also fail to enhance local distinctiveness as required by policy BE1 outlined above. The proposal would also create an unbalanced appearance to the roof and dwelling as a whole. There would therefore be a clear policy conflict with the development policies outlined above.
8. The appellant has referred to the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) entitled Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions (2008). In particular, I note at paragraph 7.8 that in relation to roof dormers on detached houses, the SPD advises that the set in should be at least 1m on detached dwellings. The dormer proposed would be set down from the ridge by 0.9m, up from the eaves by 0.7m and in from the side by 0.6m. In addition to the development plan policy conflict outlined above, there would therefore be a clear conflict with the SPD in relation to the size and siting of the dormer. The appellant contends that flexibility should be applied as the dormer would be positioned on an extension. However, I do not consider that this factor alone is sufficient justification for flexibility to be applied in the application of the SPD.
9. The appellant has submitted photographic evidence concerning an existing roof dormer at No 60 Pole Hill Road as well as a bungalow redevelopment. However, I do not have the full details or planning history in relation to these proposals. The demolition of a bungalow and its redevelopment for flats is not in my view directly related in scale or form to the issue before me. In any event, each proposal must be considered on its own merits as is the case here.
10. I therefore conclude the proposal would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would as a result conflict with policy BE1 of the LP as well as policies BE13 and BE15 of the UDP. In addition, there would also be conflict with policy BE19 of the UDP which states that new development should, amongst other things, improve the character of the area. The Council has also referred to policy BE21 however this policy relates to the issue of residential amenity and I do not consider it is directly relevant to the main issue before me.

Other matters

11. I note concerns have been expressed by a third party that the site could be used as a hostel and the proposal could add to the existing parking problems in the area. However, I can only assess the proposal based on the evidence presented which indicates the property is a private dwelling. In addition, I have no evidence before me to support the view that the extension proposed would have an adverse effect on any existing parking problems in the area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Christa Masters

INSPECTOR