



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2021 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN MIPI

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3258934

21 Thornhill Road, Ickenham UB10 8SG

- 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 Steve Evans against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 5192/APP/2020/1973, dated 29 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 August 2020.
- The development is a single storey front infill extension with new roof over including 4no. side dormers.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. During my site visit, I saw that works had already been carried out onsite. The existing property has been extended as shown within the submitted drawings, except that the front and rear gables feature significantly more glazing than shown in the submitted drawings. Therefore I have provided a recommendation on the basis that this appeal relates to a retrospective development.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site accommodates a detached dwellinghouse. The surrounding area is residential in character. Properties within the surrounding area are predominantly detached and semi-detached, two-storey dwellings and bungalows. While there is some variation in their scale and form, properties are traditional in their design. No 17, a small detached bungalow, lies immediately to the north.
 6. Although the submitted drawings do not include existing elevations, the proposed elevations provide an outline of the property prior to its recent extension, and drawing No. 4279/03 shows the original roof shape. It is clear that the roof extension has resulted in the complete loss of the original hipped
-

- roof of the host dwelling. As the raised ridge height and hip-to-gable extensions, in combination with the front infill extension, has subsumed the entire original roof form, the development has failed to respond positively to the character and appearance of the host building in an appropriately sympathetic manner.
7. Furthermore, due to their significant size and bulk, the side dormers have a particularly incongruous and over-scaled appearance that is out-of-keeping with the traditional architectural vernacular of the streetscene.
 8. The overall scale of the extensions appears especially egregious when seen in the immediate context of No 17 to the north, and so fail to integrate as part of the street. The development therefore causes unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.
 9. While I accept that the appeal site does not lie within a Conservation Area or an Area of Special Local Character, Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (2012) (the Local Plan Part 1) states that all new development should achieve a high quality of design and make a positive contribution to the local area. I have found that this is not the case in this scheme.
 10. Despite the appellant's suggestion, bungalows are a type of house, and it would be incorrect, in my view, to consider Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 – Development Management Policies (2020) (the Local Plan Part 2) applies to taller houses, but not bungalows. As such, the development must be assessed against the policy. Part E) iii) of the policy states that the raising of the main roof above the ridge line will not generally be supported. The extension clearly is in direct conflict with this part of the policy.
 11. The appellant references design guidance which, they advise, has been superseded. Consequently, as it no longer forms part of the Council's formal guidance, I afford no weight to the points made in relation to it.
 12. The appellant has drawn my attention to various examples nearby as justification for the proposal. However, many of these examples are two-storey properties and so, whilst they indicate the varied nature of the street scene, they are not directly comparable to the development before me. Regarding the two bungalow-style properties shown, these do not feature large side dormers like the proposal and so they provide no justification either. In any case, each appeal must be determined on its own merits.
 13. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development causes unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. The development therefore conflicts with Policy BE1 of the Local Plan Part 1, as stated above. The development also conflicts with Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Local Plan Part 2, which respectively state that all new development, including extensions, will be required to be designed to the highest standards, that development should be well integrated with the surrounding area, and that new extensions will be required to respect the design of the original house.
 14. The development also conflicts with Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2016), which state that all new housing developments should enhance the quality of local places and have regard to the form of an area.

Other Matters

15. The appellant states that the development represents an improvement over the original appeal property in terms of energy efficiency. However, this does not justify the identified harm that is to be caused by the development.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR