



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2020

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3249384

56B Wood End Green Road, Hayes, UB3 2SJ

- 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 Omar Laith Hassan Al Hashmimi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 54624/APP/2019/3983, dated 9 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is proposed amendments to existing dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hayes Village Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a modern 2-storey semi-detached house on the edge of the CA. The proposed rear dormer roof extension would provide an additional bedroom and shower room.
4. I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA, in accordance with the statutory duty set out in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
5. The Hayes Village Conservation Area Appraisal (September 2015) (HVCAA) identified the features that contribute to the special interest of the CA, and therefore its character, as being the retained sense of the former rural village centred on the medieval Church of St Mary, green spaces that provide a setting for the village and the varied age of historic buildings. The immediate area around the proposal site is identified as a gateway into the CA travelling along the road towards Church Walk. Section 9 of the HVCAA identifies overlarge roof extensions as one of the small-scale alterations that can harm the character or appearance of the CA.
6. The proposal would reduce the size of the dormer from that which was previously refused and dismissed at 2 appeals (ref. APP/R5510/D/18/3218559) in May 2019 and APP/R5510/C/19/3221139 in November 2019). I appreciate

the efforts made to overcome the concerns expressed by both Inspectors in the previous appeals by reducing the size of the extension. However, whilst the proposed roof extension would be below the ridge line, above the eaves and set in from the sides of the roof, it would still appear to dominate it. The site's location on a corner plot means that it would still be prominent from views from Albion Road when approaching the junction with Wood End Green Road and from the latter when travelling into the CA along Wood Green Road. Both the appearance of the building and immediate street scene would be harmed.

7. The appellant has stated that the proposal now conforms with the Council's residential extensions guidance referred to as 'HDAS'. However, the Council has confirmed that the guidance was withdrawn following the adoption of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (16th January 2020) (LP). The only current reference to dimensions for roof extensions is in policy DMHD 1, quoted in the Officer's Report. It limits the extent of roof extensions to no more than two thirds of the average width of the original roof and requires a substantial part of the roof slope to be retained above the eaves line. The proposal would not meet those requirements.
8. Given the small scale of the development, within the context of the CA as a whole, it would not harm its character. There would however be harm in terms of its appearance. The harm would be localised, limited and less than substantial but would nevertheless be contrary to policies BE1 and HE1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4 and DMHB 11 of the LP, Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (March 2016) and the National Planning Policy Framework which require development to make a positive contribution to, and enhance the character and appearance of, an area.
9. Any harm to the significance of a heritage asset requires justification in accordance with paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework. There are no public benefits that would weigh against the harm to the appearance of the CA.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has listed several extensions which are suggested as being similar to the proposal. However, none are located on a corner plot identified as a gateway to the CA and as such they are not directly comparable. In any case, I have come to my own view regarding the development rather than relying on the approach the Council may have taken elsewhere.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR