



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2017

by Oliver Blower MA (T&CP)

a person appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 5 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3173850
56 Highfield Drive, Ickenham UB10 8AN

- 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 Robin Foxall against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 61899/APP/2016/4527, dated 12 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 9 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as "*erection of a ground floor rear extension with part first floor rear extension above. erection of loft dormer conversion [sic] to rear of property*".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The Council has raised no objections to the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbours. Based on my own observations, I find no reason to disagree. I therefore consider the one main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a two-storey detached house with a half-hipped roof. It has an existing two-storey rear projection with a hipped roof and a single-storey conservatory. The immediate area is characterised by a gated development of large detached houses with half-hipped roofs, within which the appeal dwellings sits.
 4. The proposed development is for a part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension. The first floor would extend from the flank wall of the existing rear projection to beyond the flank wall of the original house. The hipped-roof of the existing projection would be extended over the new first floor to create a crown-roof, which would include a flat-roofed dormer.
 5. The development plan includes the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan saved policies, September 2007 (UDP) and the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies 2012 (LP). LP policy BE1 seeks to ensure that development achieves a high quality of design in all extensions which enhances the local distinctiveness of the area; and make a positive contribution to the local area in terms of layout, form, scale and materials.
-

6. UDP policy BE13 seeks to ensure that development will not be permitted if the layout and appearance fail to harmonise with the existing street scene or other features of the area which the local planning authority considers desirable to retain or enhance. UDP policy BE15 seeks that proposals for alterations and extensions to existing buildings will harmonise with the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the original building. UDP policy BE19 seeks to ensure that new development within residential areas complements or improves the amenity and character of the area.
7. Further guidance is given in the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions 2008 (SPD). This recommends that two-storey rear extensions should always be designed so as to appear 'subordinate' to the original house.
8. Although the proposed crown-roof has angled sides and a lower ridge height than the original roof, it would nonetheless appear overly large. Its height and width would lead to an excessively bulky structure that, rather than appearing subservient to the original roof, would dominate the roof plane of the host building. This excessive bulk would be further increased by the large dormer, so that together the new roof structures would appear significantly out of scale with the proportions of the original house. This would be particularly noticeable when viewed from the rear gardens of neighbouring properties, notwithstanding that some vegetative screening exists.
9. Although the dormer would be set back from the eaves and in from the sides, it would introduce a new flat roof form; when viewed in conjunction with the proposed crown-roof, the varied roof styles would look cluttered – competing for space in front of the same original roof plane – and give the extension a contrived and incongruous appearance that would cause further harm.
10. The Council has raised no objections to the effect of the single-storey rear extension, which would be of similar depth to the conservatory it would replace, or to the front roof lights. Based on my own observations I find no reason to disagree. I also acknowledge that the proposed materials would broadly match those of the existing dwelling. However, these factors are not sufficient to permit an otherwise unsatisfactory form of development.
11. I acknowledge that the roof extension would provide additional accommodation that would benefit the appellant and his family; however this cannot outweigh the permanent harm the development would cause for the reasons outlined above.
12. I therefore conclude that the proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. As such it conflicts with LP Policy BE1, UDP Policies BE13, BE15, BE19, and advice in the SPD. Accordingly the appeal is dismissed.

Oliver Blower

Appointed Person