



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2024

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/24/3343680

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 planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Sarwan Singh Phull against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application is Ref. 32013/APP/2023/3679.
- The development proposed is the raising of the front elevation wall and the formation of a duo-pitched roof over the existing flat roof to include a new gable end wall.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene of Kingshill Avenue.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that the appeal property is at the eastern end of a three storey parade with ground floor shops and two floors of residential use. The block has a steep pitched roof at the rear of and above a decorated projecting eaves line. There is an additional parade of the same design to the west on the other side of Adelphi Way.
4. The appeal building is also three storeys but with a flat roof below the parade's projecting eaves/parapet and with its first and second floor windows set below the fenestration of the premises in the parade. In this position at No. 260, it serves as a transition between the parade and a two storey flat roof 1960's terrace of nine commercial units. The appeal scheme seeks to increase the height of the front elevation by 1.7m and erect a pitched roof with a gable end.
5. The C20th inter-war period design of the parade and in particular its symmetry is of particular merit, whilst because of its adjacent position the appeal building is inevitably constrained as regards alterations and additions. The limited scope of the submitted plans with their cut off point on the boundary does not aid their interpretation, but it would appear that the intention is for the proposed pitched roof to match that of the parade in terms of its scale, design and external materials.

6. Ostensibly this brings with it a degree of visual harmonisation between No. 260 and the parade and I note that the grounds of appeal suggests that this would result in an improved link between the parade and the 1960's units, rather than be incongruous as the Council suggests. However, I consider that this increase of harmonisation is entirely the wrong design approach.
7. The parade with its distinctive period design is a visual entity and the existing flat roof of No. 260 provides the necessary contrast with it to act as a 'full stop' in the views from Hayes Road. As such, even without in itself having particular architectural merit, the property successfully achieves a transition between the parade and the 1960's terrace.
8. This was explained by the Inspector in the previous appeal who observed that as a step down in design terms, the appeal building works because it is '*currently subservient to the higher part of the terrace and is not dominant with regard to the lower part*'. I consider that in the current proposal the addition of the roof would introduce a confusion of design and scale that would be particularly harmful to the parade and overall have a negative effect on the character and appearance of the street scene of this part of Kingshill Avenue.
9. Accordingly, the proposal would be in harmful conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One 2012; Policies DMHB11, DMHB12 & DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two 2020, and with Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed and Beautiful Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework December 2023.

Other Matters

10. The grounds of appeal explain that the purpose of the proposed extension is to provide a watertight and weatherproof roof over the residential accommodation below and to achieve additional domestic storage in the attic thereby created. However, the appellant's agent will be aware that modern building technology professionally implemented can now achieve secure and waterproof flat roofs. The storage issue is a drawback of a refusal but not of sufficient weight to overcome the design flaws of the scheme.
11. The Council's Decision Notice included a second reason for refusal as to the absence of floor plans, perhaps on the assumption that the proposed roof would be part of a renewed attempt to secure additional residential accommodation on the site. However, I agree with the Grounds of Appeal that with the reason for the application now explained, these were not necessary as no additional residential accommodation is proposed.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons stated above as regard the main issue and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal fails.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR