



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2019

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3233203

40 Lees Road, Uxbridge UB8 3AT

- 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 Tracey Hickson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 24680/APP/2019/1399, dated 25 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension and alterations to first floor roof to create further accommodation, including side facing dormer windows, revised scheme making pairs of dormers on each side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Lees Road is a well trafficked route characterised by residential properties mainly comprising of single storey dwellings on the application site side of the road and two-storey dwellings on the opposite side. Whilst there are examples of other bungalows on Lees Road where alterations have been made to the roofs to increase the level of accommodation, the appeal dwelling is situated within a row of gable fronted bungalows at Nos 36 – 42 Lees Road which retain single storey, gable fronted pitched roof forms, the uniformity of which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Extensions (HDAS SPD) (2008) includes amongst other things that where dormer windows are provided to the side roof of a dwelling, they should be small and have a pitched or hipped roof at the same angle to the main roof slope.
5. The proposals would include the alteration of the pitch and a raising of the ridge of the existing roof. Flat roofed dormers would occupy a large proportion of both roof slopes. Even accounting for their position set down from the ridge and above the eaves of the main roof, the dormers would be a bulky addition and would fail to harmonise with the traditional pitched roof form of the dwelling and the shared characteristics of the row of bungalows that the appeal

dwelling sits within. Consequently, the proposals would be an incongruous addition and would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area.

6. The existence of varying bungalow designs some with side dormers elsewhere on Lees Road does not convince me that the proposal before me represents good design having particular regard to the position of the dwelling within the street scene amongst a row of bungalows of similar scale and architectural composition.
7. The appellant contends that the appeal scheme incorporates previous advice from the Council. In particular my attention has been drawn to the proposal to provide a pair of dormers to each roof slope, thereby breaking up the expanse of the dormers on the respective roof slopes. However, the gaps between the dormers would not sufficiently mitigate the overall perception of their bulk and dominance over the pitched roof form within the street scene. This would be particularly the case when facing towards the front elevation of the dwelling from Lees Road.
8. To conclude, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, in that regard, the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 (Built Environment) of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (2012) and the HDAS SPD.

Other Matter

9. Any lack of attempt from the Council to negotiate amendments to the scheme and whether or not the planning application was determined outside the statutory period are not matters which are material to my consideration of an appeal made under Section 78 of the Act.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out, the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR