



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2017

by Stephen Roscoe BEng MSc CEng MICE

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

Decision date: 5th October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3180611

14 Rickmansworth Road, Harefield, Uxbridge UB9 6JT

- 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 Michael Stafford against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 11669/APP/2017/463, dated 1 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 2 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is a new roof to an existing side extension.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The Council's description of the appeal development on its refusal notice differs from that in the planning application. I consider that the Council's description better describes the proposal, and I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of a pitched/crown roof over an existing single storey side/rear extension at 14 Rickmansworth Road, Harefield, Uxbridge UB9 6JT in accordance with the terms of the application 11669/APP/2017/463, dated 1 February 2017, and subject to the conditions listed at the end of this decision.

Reasons

3. The main issue in this case is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Harefield Village Conservation Area (CA) and its effect on the street scene. The appeal property includes a detached house which, although it is indicative of the 20th century growth of suburbia, is an individual 1930s style dwelling within the historic village of Harefield. The house includes a single storey side extension with a flat roof.
4. The proposal would replace the flat roof with a pitched/flat, or alternatively described as a crown top, roof which would increase the height of the extension by some 0.7m. The replacement roof would only be visible over a limited length of Rickmansworth Road due to the presence of the appeal house to one side and the house at 10 Rickmansworth Road to the other side. The front elevations of both of these houses are set forward of the extension, which have the effect of closing the extension in somewhat. With the proposal in place though, the vast majority of the gap between the houses would remain, as would a side elevation first floor window on the appeal house. A bus shelter on Rickmansworth Road also obscures part of the side extension.

5. The appeal house includes a number of roof slopes, including those on front and rear projections with hipped roofs, on dormers and on a porch. Furthermore, the proposal would be well set down from the roof of the house and well set back from its front elevation. Moreover, the eaves of the proposed roof would be some 0.4m lower than those which exist at present, and this would serve to emphasise the subordinate nature of the extension. This separation would ensure that the proposal did not visually compete with the existing roofs and would ensure that they retain their clarity and legibility. I therefore consider that the crown roof would better harmonise with these other roof slopes, the appeal house and the street scene, in accordance with Local Plan Part 2¹ Saved UDP Policies BE13 and BE15.
6. The proposal would also be of a design that would be appropriate to the identity of the original building, in terms of its scale and form, as required by Local Plan Part 1² (LP) Policy BE1. It would also preserve the roof scape and the somewhat intricate front elevation of the building which contributes to, and complements, the architectural and visual quality and character of the CA in accordance with Saved UDP Policies BE4 and BE19. Moreover, the proposal would conserve the historic environment in the CA as required by LP Policy HE1.
7. The Council considers that the height of the proposed roof would exceed 3.4m, which would conflict with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document³ (SPD). The application drawing appears, to me, to show the height of the roof as being some 100 to 200mm over a height of 3.4m although, from the scale of the drawing, this is quite difficult to judge. I am satisfied however that a height limit of 3.4m could be controlled by the imposition of an appropriate condition, to ensure compliance with the SPD.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Harefield Village CA and would not have a harmful effect on the street scene. I further conclude that it would thus not conflict with LP Policies BE1 and HE1, Saved UDP Policies BE4, BE13, BE15 and BE19 or the Council's SPD.
9. The parties have not directly suggested any conditions. I consider however that a condition to restrict the height of the proposed roof from ground level to 3.4m would be necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the CA and the street scene. The need for a height of 3.4m was raised in representations, and I am satisfied that the parties have had the opportunity to comment further on this matter.
10. I am also of the opinion that a condition to require the roof tiles to match those on the existing house would be required for the same reasons. Again, this matter has been raised in the parties' representations, and I am satisfied that the parties have had the opportunity to comment further on this subject. It would also be necessary that the development should be undertaken in accordance with the approved plan for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A condition would therefore be required to define the approved plan.

¹ London Borough of Hillingdon: Local Plan Part 2: Saved UDP Policies: November 2012

² London Borough of Hillingdon: Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies: November 2012

³ Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions: December 2008

11. Having taken into account all other matters raised, none carry sufficient weight to alter the decision, and my conclusion is based on the evidence before me in terms of policy as a whole. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Stephen Roscoe

INSPECTOR

Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan: Design Proposal Plan & Elevations: Drg No 1695/10 except in respect of the height of the new roof.
- 3) The height of the new roof hereby permitted shall not exceed 3.4m in height as measured from ground level.
- 4) Notwithstanding condition 2, the roof tiles to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall match those on the existing house.
