
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 January 2018

by Geoff Underwood BA(Hons) PGDip(Urb Cons) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 14 February 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3185889
48 Pole Hill Road, Uxbridge UB10 0QB

- 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 Syed Hussain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 33924/APP/2017/1512, dated 7 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 12 September 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as "to remove roof of existing rear extension build out to match line and match the roof line with existing".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. There is a discrepancy in how the existing building is shown in relation to the boundaries of the plot between that shown on the existing and proposed plans and elevations and that shown on the Block Plan and Location Plan. From my observations the more acutely tapering site shown on the latter two appear to more accurately represent the site's configuration. The effect is that the south east corner of the proposed extension would be situated closer to the site boundary than is shown on the proposed plan. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.
3. The proposed drawings show a different configuration of dormer windows on existing and proposed plans and elevations. However the description of development does not refer to dormers and the Council determined the application on the basis that it related to a rear extension only. I have considered the appeal on the same basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a modest detached bungalow in a street with similar properties on both sides extending northwards along Pole Hill Road. It occupies a prominent position on the corner of Pole Hill Road and Harrow View and as a result its flank and rear elevations are considerably more apparent in the streetscene than those of other bungalows in the street. The property has

- a simple pitched roof configuration with gables to front and rear, large box type dormers on either side and single storey extensions to the rear.
6. The proposed extension would match the pitched roof form of the existing building and the drawings show that it would project rearwards slightly beyond the deepest of the existing single store extensions. The proposal would be simple in form, extending the main form of the host building rewards. However, the extension would be considerably closer to the site boundary than the existing rear gable or extensions due to the tapering nature of the site in relation to the side elevation of the property. As a result of its height, scale, bulk and massing at its nearest point to Harrow View it would appear cramped within the site and visually intrusive in the established streetscape along Harrow View when viewed in either direction.
 7. The proposed extension would accord in some respects with advice in the Council's guidance¹ insofar as it would have a pitched roof which would not exceed the existing height and the roof and eaves lines would be parallel to those of the existing building. However the form of the roof, in extending the existing, would not be subordinate nor have a lower ridge height as advised in the guidance. Much of the remaining guidance for rear two storey extensions focuses on avoiding adverse effects on neighbouring properties, an aspect to which the Council raises no objection.
 8. Similar elongated configurations of bungalows are present elsewhere along Pole Hill Road, largely concentrated towards the north end of the group. These elongated forms, although they do not predominate, are a relatively common feature in the street and in such a context the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building itself would be less marked. However, based on the appellant's aerial photographs and my observations none are situated at an angle on a corner plot in a similar configuration to the appeal proposal. These other examples do not therefore lead me to consider that the proposal's effect on the streetscene would be acceptable.
 9. Whilst the proposal would have a simpler roof form than the three levels of roofs on the existing extensions it would replace or incorporate, any visual benefits this may bring would be outweighed by the detrimental effects of the extension on the wider character and appearance of the area.
 10. As it would fail to harmonise with the streetscene and not complement or improve visual amenity of the area, the development would be contrary to Local Plan² Policy BE1 and saved UDP³ Policies BE13 and BE19. Given my findings in relation to the existing building the proposal would not conflict with saved UDP Policy BE15.

Other Matters

11. I can appreciate that the appellant has made a number of attempts to secure planning permission for various extensions and alterations to his property. He considers that he is unable to move into the property until he can complete works including those subject to this appeal. The appellant has referred to the

¹ Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document - Residential Extensions, 2008.

² A Vision For 2026, Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies, 2012.

³ London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (UDP), 1998.

Human Rights Act 1998, which incorporates Articles 8 and 14 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

12. Article 8 is a qualified right to respect for private and family life and home. My findings that the development would be harmful to character and appearance relates to proposed extensions and there is no evidence to indicate that this would prevent the use or enjoyment of the existing dwelling. Dismissing this appeal would not be a disproportionate interference with that right. Article 14 prohibits discrimination, although the appellant has not provided any details of how he considers that this right would be violated. I do not consider that by dismissing the appeal that this would in itself discriminate in any way against the appellant nor lead to any discrimination. On this basis I do not consider that my decision would be incompatible with these rights.
13. Although the appellant advises that his scheme was considered acceptable by Council officers before a change in personnel, this does not lead me to consider that the proposal would be acceptable and in any event I have considered the appeal on its merits.
14. Various appeals⁴ relating to previous proposals on the site have been dismissed. However, I noted that in those schemes which included roof extensions, the Inspectors' concerns lay largely with the effect of dormers and are therefore less pertinent to the particular issues raised by the appeal before me.

Conclusion

15. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, the development would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Geoff Underwood

INSPECTOR

⁴ APP/R5510/D/17/3167658, APP/R5510/A/14/2217097 etc., APP/R5510/D/13/2209822, APP/R5510/D/13/2205399 and APP/R5510/D/13/2203796.