

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2017

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 28 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3171030

16 The Paddock, Ickenham UB10 8RB

- 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 Benjamin Pittaway and Ms Sarah MacLeod against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 26094/APP/2016/4463, dated 12 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable roof – loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, in particular the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling which has been altered by the addition of a 2-storey side extension. The property is located at the junction of The Paddock and Edinburgh Drive and is situated within a predominately residential area. The surrounding dwellings vary in design, including both hipped and gabled roof forms, but they are mainly modest sized 2-storey semi-detached properties. The proposed development includes the alteration of the property's roof from a hip to gable form and the erection of a dormer within the enlarged rear roofslope.
 4. Some of the dwellings within the surrounding area have been altered by the addition of side, rear or roof extensions. As noted by the appellant, there are examples of dwellings where hip to gable roof alterations have occurred. However, the majority of these other schemes do not appear to have involved a roof alteration above both the original dwelling and a side extension. Also, some of these altered dwellings at roof level do not help the appellant's case because they fail to exemplify good design. Further, although the contribution of these other schemes to the character and appearance of the streetscenes were noted during the site visit, their detailed planning circumstances have not
-

been provided. For these reasons, only limited weight has been attached to these other schemes in the determination of this appeal and the proposed development has been assessed on its own circumstances.

5. The existing side addition has increased the property's original width and there is already a modest effect on the symmetry of this pair of semi-detached dwellings when viewed from both roads. The resulting size of the proposed gable roof form extending across both the original property and side addition would accentuate the unbalanced symmetry of these semi-detached dwellings. The unbalancing effect would also be far greater in extent when compared to other hip to gable roof alterations which have occurred near-by.
6. By reason of its prominent corner location, the proposed rear dormer would be visible from viewpoints along Edinburgh Drive. Although the design of the proposed dormer would meet the minimum guidance contained in the Council's *Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Extensions* concerning setbacks from the ridge, eaves and edges of the existing roof, the width of this element of the appeal scheme would still appear a bulky addition to the property. The bulk of the dormer extending across both the original property and side addition would significantly disrupt the symmetry of this pair of semi-detached properties.
7. The increase in the overall scale and bulk of this already extended property's roof associated with both the proposed alteration to the roof form and the erection of the rear dormer would combine to cause unacceptable harm to the appearance of this pair of semi-detached properties. Further, the resulting scale and bulk of the property would detract from its contribution to the streetscene which is characterised by more modest sized dwellings. The appellant has identified that there are family circumstances associated with the need for additional accommodation. Although these circumstances have been carefully noted they are demonstrably and significantly outweighed by the unacceptable harm which has been identified.
8. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, in particular the streetscene, and, as such, it would conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies and Policies BE13, BE15, and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Saved UDP. These policies include reference to promoting high quality design for all developments and for both developments and residential extensions to take into account the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) core principle of securing high quality design. Accordingly, and taking into account all other matters, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR