



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 October 2020

by **L McKay MA MRTPI**

Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd November 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3255638

35 Glisson Road, Uxbridge UB10 0HJ

- 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 Marek Weber against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 19172/APP/2020/1051, dated 28 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is ground and first floor rear extensions, hip-to-gable roof extension and rear dormer window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. At the time of my site visit, I saw that the development had been completed and appeared to accord with the submitted plan. Therefore, I have determined the appeal on the basis that the development has already occurred.
3. There is another appeal by the appellant for development at Nos 33 and 35 Glisson Road. Although the two proposals in part serve the same land, they differ in terms of what is proposed. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined these two appeals on their individual merits. The other appeal will be the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the development on: the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area; and the living conditions of the occupiers of 33 Glisson Road in respect of light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. Glisson Road is characterised by pairs of dwellings of similar age and design, with hipped roofs, central chimneys and prominent projecting shared gable features on the front elevation. The spacing of the pairs of dwellings and their front gables create a regular rhythm in the street scene. Despite various extensions and alterations, the dwellings are generally consistent in appearance, which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.

6. The gable roof form of the appeal property is an incongruous feature in the otherwise largely consistent roofscape of the street, and unbalances the appearance of this pair of dwellings. The enlarged roof is prominent in the street scene due to its siting near a road junction. The visual impact of the roof is exacerbated by the ridge being higher than that of No 33, which is evident both from Glisson Road in front of the pair, and in longer views from Gresham Road. The shallower roof pitch at the rear and the end of the large dormer are also visible in the gap between Nos 35 and 37 and add to the overall bulk of the roof extensions. Consequently, due to their height and bulk, the roof extensions detract from the appearance of the existing dwelling and the distinctive character of the road, and therefore do not harmonise with the local context.
7. Accordingly, the development harms the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area, and therefore conflicts with Policy BE1 of the Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1) and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2), which seek to achieve high quality design that respects local character and enhances the local distinctiveness of the area.
8. While in some roads hip-to-gable roof extensions may be relatively common, I have not been made aware of any others in the vicinity of the site and did not see any at my site visit. The appellant contends that similar changes to the roof could be undertaken as permitted development and I note that a Certificate of Lawful Development has been issued. I therefore consider that there is a realistic proposition that roof extensions, including a hip-to-gable enlargement, would be undertaken if this appeal were dismissed. Such extensions would also unbalance the pair of dwellings and impact the character of the area. However, I have not been provided with the plans which the Certificate relates to, and as such cannot be certain that the scale of those extensions would be comparable to those before me.
9. Furthermore, the increased ridge height would not be permitted development, and this element of the appeal scheme has a significant adverse impact on the overall appearance and bulk of the roof extensions. Consequently, while there is a realistic fall-back position available to the appellant, there is no compelling evidence before me that it would be as harmful as the development before me, and it does not therefore outweigh the harm I have identified.

Living conditions

10. The first-floor rear extension is slightly deeper than was previously approved, and the main parties dispute whether this infringes a 45-degree line taken horizontally from the bedroom window of No 33, which Policy DMHD 1 B) vi) seeks avoid. In the absence of any drawings to show the relationship between the extension and that window, I cannot be certain that it would breach that line. However, as the extensions are sited to the north of No 33, they cannot overshadow that property. Therefore, the first-floor extension does not result in a material loss of sunlight to No 33.
11. The supporting text to Policy DMHD 1 also sets out that the '45-degree rule' will also be applied considering the height of the extension. From my observations on site and the plan submitted, I conclude that the first-floor extension does not infringe upon a 45-degree line taken vertically from the neighbouring bedroom window. As such, it does not significantly affect daylight to No 33.

12. Due to their position and scale, the ground and first floor rear extensions are visible from the bedroom window of No 33. However, the outlook from that window to the rear and other side is unobstructed. The first-floor extension has a relatively low, hipped roof, and given the separation distance from the bedroom window of No 33, does not appear to be a dominant feature from that window, or particularly visually intrusive. I am also mindful that an extension of similar scale has already been permitted, and the relatively small increase in depth would not significantly increase its impact on the outlook from No 33. Consequently, while there would be some impact, the extensions do not result in an unacceptable loss of outlook for No 33.
13. Accordingly, the extensions do not significantly adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of No 33 in respect of light and outlook. I therefore find no conflict with LPP2 Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 which seek to avoid adverse impacts on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and to ensure that extensions achieve a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings.

Conclusion

14. I have found that the extensions harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. While I have found that there is no significant adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 33, this does not outweigh the harm that I have identified in character and appearance terms. Therefore, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR