



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2019

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3229681 81 North View, Eastcote HA5 1PX

- 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 Mrs Souster against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 16783/APP/2019/48 dated 19 December 2018 was refused by notice dated 8 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'loft conversion with permitted development rights as the property is a sandbox style it must be submitted under a householder application which complies with (Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document) under 50cu.m. Connected to existing drainage system and extended where required. 1 No. new roof lights to the front elevation. New dormer constructed to the rear of the property with the same coloured window to the existing windows. 1018.17.GEN.01 rev2'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council considers there is a discrepancy between the proposed floor plan and the west elevation as it does not illustrate the enlarged staircase circulation space. Whilst noting this, I have determined the appeal scheme on the basis of the drawings before me.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached two storey dwelling within a residential suburb comprising of a variety of house types and styles. During my site visit I saw that many properties have been altered from their original form with a variety of extensions, rear dormers and other roof alterations. The appeal site itself has been extended from its original construction. Also, by virtue of alterations to its attached neighbour of 79 North View Road, the symmetry between the two properties has been reduced.
5. The proposed development consists of alterations to the east elevation, rear dormer and the new hipped roof tying into the ridgeline of the main roof.

Taking these extensions into account, due to the scale and massing created, this would result in a form of development that is out of proportion with the main dwelling. This is because the additional mass created including the dormer with its ridge very close to that of the new roof, and on account of its height and depth, would overall, lead to a bulky appearance to the roof. The result is an uncharacteristic addition to the host dwelling and the streetscene. Whilst the appellant has drawn my attention to examples of extensions close by, I have not been provided with the details of how these have arisen. However, in any case, each proposal is considered on its own individual merits.

6. Given the prominent nature of the development proposed, it would not appear subordinate to the host dwelling and in turn results in a proposal that is overly dominant and an incongruous feature within the street-scene. This therefore causes harm to the character and appearance of the street-scene.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would fail to accord with Policy BE1 of the *Hillingdon Borough Council Local Plan Part 1 Strategic Policies* November 2012 which amongst other aims seeks to ensure that all developments improve and maintain the quality of the built environment, as supported by the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions 2008. There would also be conflict with emerging policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the *Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies* (November 2012) which amongst other aims seek to improve the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR