
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2017

by Caroline Mulloy BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21st March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/16/3165259
104A Cowley Road, Uxbridge UB8 2LX

- 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 Mohammad Abul Kalam against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 3459/APP/2016/2947, dated 8 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 3 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is construction of timber dormer to rear roof slope to facilitate habitable room to loft area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises of a first floor mid-terrace two bedroom flat situated above a retail unit in a parade of shops on the east side of Cowley Road. The roof of the property is asymmetrical with the rear roof extending over the rear projection. There have been no roof extensions and hence the terrace retains its original roof profile. Permission is sought for a rear dormer window and two front roof lights. The Council does not raise concerns regarding the proposed front roof lights and from everything which I have seen in submissions and on my site visit, I have no reason to disagree.
 4. Paragraph 7.7 of the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) 'Residential Extensions' Supplementary Planning Document 2008 states that a dormer window must be constructed in the centre of the roof face. As a guide, any roof extension to a terraced house should be set at least 0.3m below the ridge level, at least 0.5m above the eaves level and at least 0.5m from the sides of the roof.
 5. The dormer would be constructed with red concrete tiles and white uPVC windows to match the existing property and would be set approximately 0.3m down from the ridge. However, the dormer would only be set in approximately 0.1m from one side of the roof and approximately 0.4m in from the other side. It would also be set approximately 0.2m above the eaves. The dormer would occupy virtually the entire width of the existing roof and would thus fail to
-

appear secondary to the size of the roof face within which it would be set contrary to paragraph 7.5 of the HDAS. Consequently, the dormer would appear as an incongruous and dominant addition which would fail to reflect the character and appearance of the host property.

6. Furthermore, the proposal would interrupt the original roof profile of the existing terrace which remains largely unaltered at present. Contrary to the assertion that the dormer would not be visible from any major road or by-passing public, the rear of the property faces onto a back lane and hence the dormer would be highly visible to users of the back lane. Consequently, the dormer would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area.
7. For the reasons stated, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would, therefore, be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1-Strategic Policies (2012) which requires all new development to achieve a high quality of design in all new buildings, alterations, extensions and the public realm which enhances the local distinctiveness of the area.
8. In addition, the proposal is contrary to saved Policy BE13 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (1998) which states that development will not be permitted if the layout and appearance fail to harmonise with the existing street scene. Furthermore, conflict also arises with saved Policy BE15 which states that proposals for alterations and extensions to existing buildings will be permitted where they harmonise with the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the original building.
9. Moreover, conflict arises with saved Policy BE19 of the UDP which seeks to ensure that new development within residential areas complements or improves the amenity and character of the area. Finally, conflict arises with the HDAS.

Other Matters

10. Concerns have been raised by the occupants of the two properties to the rear at 1 and 3 Derby Road in terms of loss of privacy. However, given the distance of those properties at least 17m from the rear elevation of the appeal property I consider that the proposal would not cause any loss of privacy to the occupiers.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons stated and taking all other considerations into account, the appeal should be dismissed.

Caroline Mulloy

Inspector