



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 December 2020

by Steven Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/20/3257250

260 Kingshill Avenue, Hayes UB4 8BZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr S Singh Phull against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 32013/APP/2020/449, dated 11 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of a mansard roof and dormer incorporating 1 x studio flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Local Planning Authority (LPA) describes the proposed development as the erection of a third-floor extension to create a 1x1 bed flat. I have determined the appeal on this basis as it more accurately reflects what is proposed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the property, the terrace of which it is a part and the street scene.

Reason

4. 260 Kingshill Avenue is a three-storey building within a terrace row which has shops and commercial uses on the ground floor and living spaces above. A strip of hard surfaced land in front of the terrace allows for parking in a line and at right angles to the adjoining road. The appeal property itself comprises a first and second floor maisonette above a take-away. It has a flat roof. To one side of it, the three-storey terrace is taller and with a double pitched gabled roof. To the other side the terrace, is a more modern 2 storey part of the terrace with a flat roof and with a lesser height.
5. At the moment, the appeal building acts as a step down in design terms between the taller part of the terrace on one side with a pitched roof and the terrace on the other with a lesser height and a flat roof. It is currently subservient to the higher part of the terrace and is not dominant with regard to the lower part.

6. The proposed addition of an extra floor with a mansard roof would mean that it would compete with, and appear incongruous with the higher part of the terrace, which has the pitched roof, and because of the differing roof shapes which would be brought closer together at the upper level. The visual proximity of the existing pitched roof and the proposed mansard roof of the appeal property would appear discordant when viewed from the road in front of it.
7. Furthermore, the proposed development, by the addition of an extra floor, would also appear dominant and out of place when viewed against the existing two storey terrace to the other side with its lesser height.
8. The proposed dormer would be less intrusive, and I find that it would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the area.
9. However, I conclude that the proposed development, by its height and its mansard roof, would have an incongruous impact on both the terrace on one side and the terrace on the other, and as such would have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the building itself, the terrace as a whole and the street scene.
10. Therefore, when the proposal is considered as a whole, it would not accord with the design requirements of policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local plan: Part One-Strategic Policies 2012 (HLP), and with policies DMHD1, DMHB11 and DMHB12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part two- Development Management Policies 2020 (DMP).

Other Matters

11. I appreciate that the proposed apartment would be suitably located in relation to public transport, services and facilities and that it would boost the supply and mix of housing in the area. However, these matters do not outweigh the significant harm which I have identified in respect of my conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Steven Hartley

INSPECTOR