



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2020

by **L McKay MA MRTPI**

Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29TH October 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3254070

11 Honeycroft Hill, Uxbridge UB10 9NQ

- 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 Czastka against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 33016/APP/2020/1031, dated 27 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey side/rear extension, conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer and 2 front roof lights and single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant has submitted an amended plan as part of the appeal, which seeks to alter the roof of the proposed front extension to correct a drawing error. The appeal was made as a Householder Appeal, which follows a streamlined procedure, with no opportunity for the Local Planning Authority (LPA) or interested parties to provide comments on the appellant's appeal submissions. As the design of the front extension forms part of the LPA's reasons for refusal, it would not be appropriate for me to accept an amended plan without giving those who might want to comment on it the opportunity to do so. I have therefore dealt with the appeal based on the plans which were considered by the LPA.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property and its attached neighbour No 9 are part of a row of pairs of dwellings on this side of Honeycroft Hill. While there are several styles of dwelling, hipped roofs and two storey bay windows are common to almost all of them. Although several properties have extensions of various designs, bay windows remain prominent, distinctive features which give this part of the road a consistent character, in contrast to the variety of building forms opposite and further along the road. The appeal property shares these characteristic features and contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.

5. The proposed side extension would be more than half the width of the existing dwelling and would project forward of the front wall at ground floor level. Combined with the proposed front extension, this would create a large addition wrapping around the existing dwelling, which would be a prominent and dominant feature in the street scene. The proposal would retain a reasonable gap to the side boundary and the set back at first floor would result in the roof being lower than that of the existing dwelling. However, due to their overall scale and bulk, the proposed front and side extensions would not appear subordinate to the existing dwelling.
6. Due to its width and height, the proposed extension across the front of the dwelling would compete with the prominence of the bay windows as the key feature of the front elevation. The flat front face of the proposed extension and single expanse of roof would emphasise its scale, and it would lack the articulation of other combinations of porches and side extensions nearby. As such, it would not respect the features of the existing dwelling and would detrimentally alter its appearance. Consequently, although it would use matching materials and window styles, overall the proposal would not respect the design and architectural composition of the existing dwelling and would not harmonise with the local context.
7. Several properties in this part of the road have two storey side extensions of various designs, including those either side of the appeal site. Some of these exceed half the width of the original property, while others have a ground floor section extending forward of the main front wall, level with the bay window, with a pitched roof over the projecting section. Some properties have also added separate porches. I have not however been made aware of any which combine all three elements in the way now proposed. As such, they are not directly comparable to the appeal proposal, and their impact on the original dwellings and the street scene is materially different. The proposal would not therefore maintain continuity or uniformity in the street scene, as the appellants suggests.
8. The proposed rear dormer would retain a gap to either side and to the eaves of the proposed extended roof, however it would sit close to the ridge of the proposed side extension and would extend well beyond the side of the original roof. As such, it would be a large and dominant feature on the rear elevation and would not appear subservient to the scale of either the original roof or the proposed extended roof. Although it would not be easily seen from the street, it would be clearly visible from neighbouring properties and therefore would detract from the appearance of the existing dwelling.
9. There are other dormers nearby, however only the dormer at No 15, was visible from the rear garden of the appeal site. I do not have details of the circumstances under which this came to be built. Due to the small number of other dormers in the local area, their presence has not significantly altered the roof scape, or character and appearance of the local area, and as such does not justify the harmful impact of the appeal proposal.
10. Accordingly, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area, and would therefore conflict with Policy BE1 of the Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1) and LPP2 Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB12, which seek to achieve high quality design that respects local character and is well integrated with the surrounding area.

11. Section A of LPP2 Policy DMHD1 sets out general criteria for all alterations and extensions to dwellings, while sections B to F set out specific criteria for different types of development. Although in some instances the wording sets out that the criteria 'should', rather than 'must', be met, others are more definite. Nevertheless, the policy forms part of the development plan, rather than being 'no more than guidance' as the appellant suggests. As the LPP2 was only recently adopted, it must have been consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework to have been found sound. While there may be some circumstances where developments which conflict with the criteria of Policy DMHD1 may not result in harm, for the reasons given above the proposal would conflict with the overarching requirements of section A as well as development specific criteria in sections C, D and E. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with that Policy.

Other Matters

12. Due to their limited number, size and siting high up on the roof, the proposed rooflights would not materially harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would also safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, and sufficient parking could be provided to serve the extended dwelling. These are however of neutral consequence and do not justify the harm identified above.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR