
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2017

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3181722

25 Edwards Avenue, Ruislip HA4 6UP

- 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 Dr Vikram Jhajj against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 69129/APP/2017/1008, dated 18 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 22 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as: "*Loft conversion. Existing right hip roof to be converted to a right gable roof with proposed dormer extending at the rear of the property, ending 20cm from the original eaves. One glazed window proposed on the right side of the converted roof (no opening) in addition to two skylights on the front of the pre-existing angled roof.*".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the street scene.

Procedural Matter

3. In the interest of brevity and clarity I have included the first half of the description of development provided on the planning application form in the banner heading above.

Reasons

4. The appeal property forms one end of a short terrace of three 2-storey houses with a hipped roof form. It is situated in a residential street comprising a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced houses and bungalows of varied design and age, giving the street an eclectic character and appearance. Whilst nearby bungalows have been extended to the side at roof level, the street-facing roof slopes of the more prominent 2-storey properties in the immediate area and generally unaltered.
5. The proposal would involve a hip to gable roof addition combined with a full-width rear dormer addition. This would add substantial bulk to the roof of the property which would be visible from both Edwards Avenue and Bourne Avenue. In particular, the side addition would be an incongruous element in views along Edwards Avenue whilst the rear part would effectively create a flat-

roofed third storey at the rear. In addition the proposal would severely disrupt the symmetry and balance of the terrace.

6. For these reasons I conclude that, due to its siting, bulk, massing and design the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the terrace and the street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (2012). Amongst other matters these policies require new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment; harmonise with the existing street scene and the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of original buildings; and complement or improve the character of an area.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR