
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2017

by I Jenkins BSc CEng MICE MCIWEM

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

Decision date: 26 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3175768
47 Berkeley Road, Uxbridge, UB10 9DX

- 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 Piotr Kubicki against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 66315/APP/2017/625, dated 21 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with a gable wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the terrace of which No. 47 forms part, the street scene and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. In common with most other terraces in the street, a dual pitched profile is prominent characteristic of the roof line of the terrace of which No. 47 forms part and predominantly the roofs of the end of terrace houses, including the appeal property, have hipped ends. The proposal includes the extension of the roof of No. 47 from a hipped to a gable end and the provision of a flat roofed rear dormer.
 4. The *Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS)-Supplementary Planning Document-Residential Extensions* indicates that permission will normally be refused for conversion of a sloped hip-end roof into a flat gable end roof on the basis that it would unbalance the overall appearance of the terrace. I consider that the proposal would unbalance the symmetrical roof form of the terrace of which No. 47 forms part. Nevertheless, from the public vantage points at which both ends of the terrace can be seen simultaneously, one or both of the ends of the terrace are seen at such an oblique angle that the associated hipped profile of the roof end is not easily discernible. Therefore, from those vantage points it is unlikely that the proposed hip to gable extension would be actually seen to unbalance the appearance of the terrace. Under these circumstances, in my judgement, the proposed hip to gable element of the scheme would be acceptable.
-

5. However, to my mind, the same cannot be said for the proposed flat roofed rear dormer. The HDAS indicates that as a guide, a rear dormer should be set in from the sides of the roof by at least 0.5 metres. The proposed dormer would be much closer to the proposed gable end of No. 47. I consider that, as a result, it would not be a subservient feature of the roof and instead would have an awkward and unduly obtrusive appearance when seen from Berkeley Road, to the extent that a dual pitched profile would no longer be the dominant characteristic of the roof of No. 47 to the detriment of the character and appearance of the terrace of which No. 47 forms part.
6. The appellant has indicated that in recent years the Council has granted planning approval for 3 extensions that are similar to the appeal proposal. However, I have not been provided with the associated decision notices or officer reports and, based on the evidence presented, I cannot be sure whether the circumstances in those cases are directly comparable to those in the case before me. Whilst consistency is desirable, each case must be considered primarily on its own merits. Although I have had regard to the small number of other properties in the street with dormer additions and gable/dormer additions, the visual impact of those developments reinforces my view regarding the harm that would be caused.
7. I conclude overall, that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the terrace of which No. 47 forms part, the street scene and the surrounding area, contrary to Policy BE1 of the *Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One-Strategic Policies (adopted November 2012)* and Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the *London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (1998) Saved Policies* and the HDAS. Insofar as these policies and guidance seek to ensure that development has regard to local character and give encouragement to the promotion of local distinctiveness they are consistent with the aims of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework).

Other matters

8. I have had regard to the appellant's desire to continue living in Hillingdon and that the proposal would provide additional accommodation for his family. Although there is no evidence before me to show that it is needed for a particular purpose or that there are needs which could not be met by other accommodation in the local area. In my judgement, the benefits of the proposal identified by the appellant would not outweigh the harm that I have identified in relation to the main issue.

Conclusions

9. I conclude on balance that the proposal would not amount to sustainable development, under the terms of the Framework and it would conflict with the Development Plan taken as a whole. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

I Jenkins

INSPECTOR