

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2021 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 April 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3262229

8 Pole Hill Road, Uxbridge UB10 0PZ

- 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 Qudrathullah Amir against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 57736/APP/2020/2285, dated 16 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion to create two bedrooms within a rear dormer to the rear. A nominal increase in roof ridge to create required roof height. Two new roof windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

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

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is occupied by a two-storey detached dwelling with single storey rear and side extensions. The surrounding area is suburban and residential in nature with the neighbouring properties comprising a variety of styles, including semi-detached and terraced dwellings. The proposed development would convert the loft into habitable accommodation and includes raising the roof height, a hip to gable roof extension, rooflights to the front and a box dormer to the rear.
5. The proposed rear dormer would be very slightly set back from the eaves and set in from the sides, it would be positioned high on the roof slope, almost touching the ridge, and would nearly cover the entirety of the proposed rear roof slope. As such, in the context of the new roof, the proposed dormer would appear as a significant addition to the dwelling which would appear overly large and would create a dominant roofscape. The proposed dormer would not be subordinate to the host dwelling to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

6. The dormer would be located to the rear of the property. However, due to the detached nature of the dwelling, it would still be partially visible from Pole Hill Road as well as to the occupiers of the surrounding dwellings. Therefore, its prominent appearance would still result in harm to the streetscene and the surrounding area. It is noted that the proposal would use materials which match the main dwelling, however this would not outweigh the harm found. Furthermore, although the appeal site is not within a Conservation Area which may provide a greater flexibility with regards to design, this would not justify the proposal's overly dominant nature and impact upon the surrounding area.
7. Policy DMHD1 of the Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) states that roof extensions should be subservient to the scale of the existing roof and should not exceed more than two thirds the average width of the original roof. As it has been identified that the proposed dormer would not be subservient to the scale of the roof and would significantly exceed two thirds of the width of the roof, this part of the proposal would not be in accordance with the stipulations of this policy.
8. The appellant has indicated that there are other dormers within Pole Hill Road which exceed two thirds of the width of the roof. However, no specific developments have been highlighted and it was noted during the site visit that large box dormers are not a prevalent feature within the area and therefore do not markedly contribute to the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, although the appeal property may be the only detached house within Pole Hill Road, the stipulations within Policy DMHD1 make no concessions for detached dwellings and despite the detached nature of the property the proposed dormer would still appear overly large. Also, although the appellant has suggested that the proposal is close to what can be constructed under permitted development rights, they acknowledge that it cannot be. I agree with this finding and therefore this carries little weight.
9. The Council have raised no objections with regard to the other aspects of the proposal and I have no reason to disagree with their findings. Nonetheless, the proposed rear dormer would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Local Plan Part 1 Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHB11 and DMHD1 of the Part 2 Local Plan. These policies collectively seek to provide a high quality of design, taking into account the scale of development with poorly designed and overly-large roof extensions not supported.

Conclusions and Recommendation

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

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. 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