The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 October 2020

by L McKay MA MRTPI

Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th November 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/20/3257339
33 & 35 Glisson Road, Uxbridge UB10 0HJ

- 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 Marek Weber against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 75541/APP/2020/1281, dated 22 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 July 2020.
- The development proposed is hip-to-gable roof extensions, raised ridge height and rear dormer windows to numbers 33 & 35, ground and first floor extensions to number 35.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. There is another appeal by the appellant for development at No 35 Glisson Road. Although the two proposals in part serve the same land, they differ in terms of what is proposed. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined these two appeals on their individual merits and the other appeal is the subject of a separate decision.

3. No 35 has already been extended with a 'hip-to-gable' roof extension, raised ridge height, a rear dormer and ground and first-floor rear extensions, without planning permission. This proposal seeks to retain aspects of these, but with changes to the dormer and extension, in addition to the proposed works to No 33. I have therefore considered the appeal on the basis that part of the development has already occurred.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of the occupiers of 33 Glisson Road in respect of light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. Glisson Road is characterised by pairs of dwellings of similar age and design, with hipped roofs, central chimneys and prominent projecting shared gable features on the front elevation. The spacing of the pairs of dwellings and their front gables create a regular rhythm in the street scene, and despite various

extensions and alterations, the dwellings are generally consistent in appearance and height. These features give the area a distinctive character.

6. The gable roofs proposed would be an incongruous and discordant feature in this area, which is characterised by hipped roofs. The increased height of this pair relative to surrounding properties would significantly exacerbate this visual impact and reinforce the difference between this pair and surrounding dwellings. The appeal site is particularly visible in the public realm due to its position opposite Gresham Road, which allows views of the site from some distance. The proposed changes in roof form would be evident in these views, and would contrast harmfully with the otherwise largely consistent roofscape of the area.

7. Little of the proposed rear dormers would be seen from the street, as they would be set in from the sides of the enlarged roofs, however the shallower roof pitch at the rear would be visible in gaps between dwellings. Overall, the increased height, bulk and significant change in roof form proposed would detract from the appearance of the existing dwellings and the distinctive character of the area, and as such would not harmonise with the local context.

8. The hip-to-gable extension of No 35 unbalances the appearance of this pair of dwellings and is a prominent and discordant feature in the street scene, particularly as the ridge is higher than that of No 33. Therefore, in itself it harms the appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. The proposed extension to the roof of No 33 would return some balance to the pair, however there is no mechanism before me to ensure it would ever be carried out if this appeal were allowed. Moreover, the extensions to No 35 are currently unauthorised, and as such do not justify allowing further harmful development.

9. The proposed first-floor rear extension would not be easily visible from public viewpoints, however it would be seen from neighbouring properties, and due to its flat roof, would appear as a discordant feature in an area of predominantly pitched roofs. While it would remove the slightly awkward junction with the dormer, I am mindful that the dormer does not benefit from planning permission. Consequently, the proposed flat roof would not be in keeping with the character of the existing dwelling, and would therefore harm the character and appearance of the area.

10. Hip-to-gable extensions could be undertaken as permitted development for both properties, which would also result in a change in roof form. However, an increase in ridge height would not be permitted development, and as such this potential fall-back would not result in as much harm as the appeal proposal. Therefore, the potential to use permitted development rights does not justify the harm I have identified.

11. Accordingly, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1) and Policies DMHD1, DMHB11 and DMHB12 of the Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2), which together seek to achieve high quality design.

Living conditions

12. The first-floor rear extension as built is apparently slightly deeper than was previously approved, and the main parties dispute whether this infringes a 45-

degree line taken horizontally from the bedroom window of No 33, which Policy DMHD 1 seeks to avoid. It is not clear from the submitted plans whether it does breach such a line, however even if it does, the extensions are sited to the north of No 33, and therefore cannot overshadow that neighbouring property. Therefore, the first-floor extension as proposed would not result in a material loss of sunlight to No 33.

13. Due to their position and scale, the ground and first floor rear extensions are visible from the bedroom window of No 33. However, the outlook from that window to the rear and other side is unobstructed. Given the separation distance from the bedroom window of No 33 and the flat roof proposed, the proposed first-floor extension would not be a dominant feature from that window, or particularly visually intrusive. While it would be slightly deeper than the extension previously permitted, the roof would be less bulky and therefore, the proposed first-floor extension would not have a materially greater impact on the outlook from No 33 than the approved scheme. As such, it would not result in an unacceptable loss of outlook for No 33.

14. Consequently, the proposal would not significantly adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of No 33 in respect of light and outlook. I therefore find no conflict with those parts of LPP2 Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD1 which seek to avoid adverse impacts on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. However, the lack of harm in this regard does not outweigh the harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

15. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR