



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 September 2021 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3274340

29 Grange Road, Hayes, UB3 2RP

- 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 H. Khalsa against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 10616/APP/2021/265, dated 22 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is a roof conversion including the provision of a hip-to-gable extension and a rear dormer.
-

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, including the Hayes Village Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on the western side of Grange Road which is in an established residential area characterised mostly by semi-detached properties with hipped roofs and a staggered building line. I did however note there are two neighbouring bungalows to the north of the appeal dwelling as well as two semi-detached properties at Nos. 39 & 41 Grange Road which feature hip-to-gable roofs.
 5. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. In this respect national policy on heritage assets, which includes conservation areas, is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). At paragraph 197, it sets out matters which should be taken into account including sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
-

6. The appeal site lies within the Hayes Village Conservation Area (HVCA) which covers a large area in Hayes incorporating the Norman Leddy Memorial Gardens and Barra Hall Park. It is bounded to the north by the Uxbridge Road (A4020) and to the south by Freemans Lane. Its significance derives from its distinctive areas of interconnected open and wooded green spaces, built evidence of the mediaeval village at Hayes centred on the Church of St Mary, and a richly varied townscape of historic buildings and building groups, dating from the medieval period and the 18th-20th centuries. The character of the area is established by its spaciousness and green spaces as well as by the varied townscape and listed buildings that make a positive contribution to the appearance of the HVCA.
7. The appeal dwelling is located on the western boundary of the HVCA and is oriented towards the Norman Leddy Gardens. The HVCA appraisal document refers to the wide grassy verges and planting, and the brick wall set back along the west side of Grange Road being a surviving boundary of the now-demolished Wood End House. The appeal dwelling and the neighbouring properties on Grange Road form the backdrop to this attractive landscaped verge when seen from the dual carriageway to the east, Wood End, and open green space beyond.
8. The resultant dwelling features a hip-to-gable roof which contrasts with the adjacent hipped roof dwelling at No.27. Although the appellant contends the roof alteration is a logical and proportionate addition to the appeal dwelling, I find that the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached properties has been significantly unbalanced. Whilst I recognise that the quoin detailing and the original double heighten bay and gable to the front elevation have been retained and mirror No.27, these features are fairly minor compared to the considerable scale of the alterations to the entire roof structure and profile. The altered hip-to-gable roof appears awkward and obtrusive, and has significantly harmed the original form and appearance of the property. Furthermore, I concur with the Council in that the installation of an incongruous ridge tile detail between the two properties along the roof line serves to accentuate the contrasting differences in appearance between Nos. 27 and 29.
9. Turning to the rear dormer roof extension, it exceeds more than two thirds the average width of the original roof and has failed to retain a substantial element of the original roof slope. It is also not sufficiently set-in from both sides of the roofslope above the eaves line as required by Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (the 'Local Plan - Part 2') and, as a consequence, it appears overly large and bulky. Despite the use of sympathetic materials and fenestration, I find it does not appear sufficiently subservient to the host dwelling and appears as a disproportionate addition when seen from surrounding properties as well as from Grange Road. Indeed, due to the bend in the road and the staggered building line, the rear dormer is readily visible from the northern end of Grange Road.
10. The appeal property and its altered roof form occupies a prominent position in the streetscene. Notwithstanding the mature trees that stand within the verge between Grange Road and Wood End, the unbalanced roof form of the pair of semi-detached dwellings can be easily seen through the gaps in the vegetation. It has a negative visual impact on the Conservation Area as it harms the symmetrical rhythm of the street scene which is defined by consistent roof forms. Whilst I recognise there is some variety in built form and scale on

Grange Road given the hip-to-gable properties at Nos. 39 & 41 and the bungalows to the north of the appeal dwelling, there is nevertheless a degree of consistency and symmetry in the streetscene expressed through the building line and matching roof forms. Nos. 27 & 29 stand out in this regard due to their incoherent and disjointed roof forms.

11. My attention has been drawn to other developments in the vicinity, the appellant referring to a nearby rear dormer at No. 41 Grange Road as well as the dormers attached to the neighbouring bungalows. These dormers are smaller in scale than the development in question and were not deemed to harm the HVCA. Furthermore, the replacement property at No. 17 Grange Road harmonises well with the character of the road as it is of a comparable scale to neighbouring properties and features a hipped roof. Regarding the pair of semis at Nos. 19 and 21, they appear to be adequately symmetrical despite the addition of a secondary two storey front bay and front porch at No. 21. I therefore find that these references do not lend any significant weight in favour of the proposed retention of the development.
12. I therefore find the development is not compatible with the existing dwelling and has resulted in bulky, obtrusive and architecturally discordant features that have harmed the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the HVCA. The proposed retention of the development results in less than substantial harm to the significance of the HVCA.
13. Given the above, I conclude that the proposed retention of the development would conflict with Policy DMHB 4 of the Local Plan- Part 2 and the NPPF which together seek to ensure proposals preserve or enhance the significance and distinctive character of conservation areas. The proposed retention of the development would also not adhere to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies document (the 'Local Plan – Part 1'), Policy DMHB 11 of the Local Plan – Part 2, Policy D4 of the London Plan and the NPPF which together aim to ensure proposals are well-designed and harmonise with the local context. It would also conflict with Policy DMHD 1 of the Local Plan – Part 2 as it seeks to ensure roof extensions are appropriately designed and subservient to the scale of the existing roof.
14. Furthermore, I do not find that Policy DMHB 12 of the Local Plan – Part 2, quoted in the decision notice, is directly relevant to the proposal as it relates more specifically to pedestrian legibility and the design of the public realm.
15. I have not identified any public benefits to the development which would clearly outweigh the less than substantial harm to the significance of the HVCA as a designated heritage asset. The proposed retention of the development would therefore also conflict with the NPPF's aim of conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Recommendation

16. For the above reasons, the proposal would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.
17. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR