
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2019

by Karen Taylor MSC URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Friday, 27 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3230436
231 Park Road, Uxbridge UB8 1NS

- 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 Sajid Mahmood against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 22578/APP/2019/800, dated 26 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is 2x rear-facing and 2x front-facing loft dormers/ loft conversion, with obscured windows on each of the new side gable walls.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached hipped roof bungalow situated within a residential area of a mix of various house types and designs. The site lies within the local designation area of North Uxbridge Area of Special Local Character (NUASLC). The property is constructed of brick and is of a simplistic design set back considerably from Park Road in a substantial plot and features an existing front flat roof dormer.
4. The proposed development would extend the roof form in width and height creating gable ends to both elevations of the roof with the inclusion of gable windows and the addition of both front and rear dormers. There are several properties within the area which have extended the roof form from hipped to gable. I consider this element of the proposal would not appear as an incongruous, dominant or bulky addition to the detriment of the host property or wider area. As such I have no reason to disagree with the Council on the alterations to the roof to form gable ends on both sides would be acceptable.
5. However, the alterations to the roof itself are not considered to be a separate entity to the overall development proposed. The appellant requests that a split decision be considered. As the proposed roof alterations and dormers are both not physically and functionally severable, I consider a split decision would not be a logical outcome.

6. In terms of the proposed front and rear dormers, these would be set back from the eaves with pitched roofs, projecting gables and would be very close to that of the main roof, whilst the dormers would occupy most of the roof space to the front and rear. They would be a substantial addition to any roof form of the bungalow. Although there is an existing front dormer, this is considerable smaller to the proposals, centrally positioned and of a flat roof design.
7. Therefore, the height and depth would result in bulky additions, this combined with the u-shaped design, incorporating pitch and sloping roof forms on the dormers would not result in good design and would significantly dominate and overpower the character of the host property. In combination both the proposed dormers would not appear as a subordinate addition to the roof form and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property. The use of matching materials would not be sufficient to overcome this harm.
8. Furthermore, the proposed development would be seen from along Park Road which is a main thoroughfare and would appear as an incongruous addition to the roof slope when viewed from along Park Road causing harm to the street scene and wider area, including the locally designated area of special local character (NUASLC) that seeks to preserve and enhance the local architectural character and appearance.
9. The property benefits from permitted development rights and although the Council acknowledge that a rear dormer could be constructed, I have not seen any evidence in this appeal to support such a 'fallback position' as there is no Certificate of Lawfulness of Proposed Development, neither is it the role of the Inspector to determine this. In the absence of this, I give this limited weight in the appeal decision.
10. In support of the appeal, my attention was drawn to other properties in the area that have already been extended in a similar manner to the dormers proposed. I do not know the circumstances of those cases or the policies that applied at the time of their consideration. In any event, those that I saw were of a smaller design, flat roofs and were subservient additions along the roof fronts of host properties.
11. Therefore, I find the proposed development would be contrary to Policy BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Saved Policies BE5, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (1998). These policies collectively seek to achieve a high quality of design which complements or improves the character of the area; and within areas of special local character new development should harmonise with the materials, design features and architectural style.
12. It would also be contrary to the Supplementary Planning Guidance, HDAS: Residential Extensions, the guidance advises that it is important to create roof extensions that will appear secondary to the size of the roof face and that they will be assessed against any detrimental effects on the appearance of the original house and character of the local area.

Other Matters

13. I acknowledge the appellants' desire to enlarge the family house and note the comments on pre-application advice and inconsistencies. However, these matters do not outweigh the concerns I have raised above.

Conclusion

14. I have found that the extensions to the hipped roof to form a gable roof on the property would not cause harm. However, the proposed dormers would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area (NUASLC), and this is sufficient reason to dismiss the appeal. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Karen Taylor

INSPECTOR