



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2019

by J E Jolly BA (Hons) MA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities

Decision date: 30 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/19/3222781

90a, 92a, 94, Glebe Avenue, Ickenham UB10 8PD

- 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 Alex Teasdale against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 74127/APP/2018/3159, dated 29 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is a new Mansard roof to replace the existing pitched roof and conversion of the existing No 3 flats into 6 No flats and a new hardstanding design.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in a busy residential area that has brick and tile, two-storey, detached, semi-detached and terrace housing of varying ages and styles.
4. Glebe Avenue is located at the junction with Clovelly Avenue and includes a 1 x 1-bedroom flat and 2 x 2-bedroom flats at 90a, 92a and 94 Glebe Avenue. These first-floor flats are situated above a post-war, 2-storey terrace of shops. The terrace is set back from the main highway via a service road and parking area but has a distinct street presence in the adjacent area. To the rear of Glebe Avenue and between Clovelly Avenue it is possible to access gardens, properties and business service areas as well as a range of garages and outbuildings, most of which appear to be in use.
5. The proposal would increase the number of first floor flats at 90a, 92a and 94 from three to six flats; 3 x 1-bedroom flats, 2 x studio flats and 1 x 2-bedroom flat with a Mansard style roof above.
6. The Mansard roof would be in matching materials but there would be a significant increase in its height, mass and bulk in comparison to the existing and surrounding buildings.
7. While, there are similar 3-storey commercial terraces nearby, for example in Long Lane, the context of the proposed development is different.

8. Nearby there are pleasant green verges and trees and directly adjacent the appeal site, across a relatively narrow highway, there are a pair of two-storey Victorian cottages. Similarly, in Clovelly Avenue there are more modest dwellings with hipped roofs which follow a regular street pattern.
9. The Mansard roof would not only change the scale and form of the building but also create a dominant and bulky presence in the front and side street scene which is currently generally open and of 2-storey in height.
10. The proposed fenestration for the development is uniform but it is incongruous with the design of the surrounding post-war and Victorian dwellings, which display a more unobtrusive window pattern, and this juxtaposition, as well as the mass of the development, creates visual harm to the character of the original building and surrounding area.
11. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policies BE1, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan 2012 and the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions 2008, which state amongst other things, that all new developments should achieve a high quality of design and be appropriate to the identity and context of Hillingdon's buildings and townscapes such that it harmonises with, complements or improves the character of the area.
12. For similar reasons, the proposal would be contrary to the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework, including Paragraph 127 which indicates that developments should be visually attractive and be sympathetic to the local character of the surrounding built environment.

Conclusion

13. The proposed development would not accord with the adopted development plan and as there are no material considerations, indicating a decision otherwise, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J E JOLLY

INSPECTOR