

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2017

by J Dowling BA(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3163750

8 Windmill Hill, Ruislip, Middlesex HA4 8QE

- 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 Alan Bonnell against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 68915/APP/2015/3776, dated 11 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with two side dormers (one on each side) and a rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. This appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion including side and rear dormers at 8 Windmill Hill, Ruislip, Middlesex HA4 8QE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 68915/APP/2015/3776, dated 11 May 2016 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings: Location plan, RPA/8/WMH/501, RPA/8/WMH/502, RPA/8/WMH/503, RPA/8/WMH/504 and RPA/8/WMH/505.

Procedural Matters

2. There are a number of anomalies between the application form, appeal documents and decision notice. These include:
 - the registered date shown on the Councils decision notice predates the application date shown on the application form;
 - the way in which the appellants surname is spelled; and
 - differences in the way in which the proposed development had been described.

Following clarification with the appellant, they confirmed that the application for planning permission was submitted on the 11 May 2016, the date shown on the decision letter related to an earlier application for a Certificate of Lawfulness; their surname is spelled Bonnell and the proposal is for loft

conversion with two side dormers (one on each side) and a rear dormer. I have amended the banner heading accordingly.

Application for costs

3. An application for costs was made by Mr Alan Bonnell against the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. Windmill Hill is a pleasant residential road which is characterised by two storey detached and semi-detached properties. Although it would appear that they were built around the same period I note from my site visit that there are a variety of different house designs. Many of the properties, including No 8, have been the subject of extensions and alterations.
6. Policy BE1 of A vision for 2026 Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012)(the Local Plan) and Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (adopted 1998) Saved Policies (2007)(the Saved UDP) advocate that development should maintain the quality of the built environment (BE1), harmonise with the existing streetscene (BE13) harmonise with the scale, form and proportions of the original building (BE15) and should complement and improve the amenity and character of the area (BE19). The purpose of these policies is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks, amongst other things to secure good quality design.
7. Further detailed guidance on extensions is contained within the Hillingdon Design and Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions (2008) (the SPD) which advocates that alterations to the roof should appear secondary to the size of the roof face within which they will be set¹; side and rear dormers should be located centrally within the roofspace and should remain independent of each other² and should be set in from the sides and down from the ridge³. With the exception of being set down from the ridge the proposed dormers would accord with the guidance contained within the SPD. The proposed materials and design would reflect and respect the host property.
8. I observed at my site visit that the properties in Windmill Hill have a variety of different roof forms including crown roofs, front gable ends, cat slide roofs and dormers in both the front and side roofslopes. As a result I consider when combined with the increase in levels as you progress up Windmill Hill, the proposal would have a very limited impact upon the character and appearance of both the host property and of the wider area. As a consequence I conclude that whilst the dormers would not comply with the guidance contained within

¹ Paragraph 7.5 of the SPD

² Paragraph 7.6 of the SPD

³ Paragraph 7.8 of the SPD

the SPD there would be no conflict with policy BE1 of the Local Plan and policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the UDP.

Other matters

9. Whilst I note that there have been several references to the site having a history of enforcement investigations relating to unlawful development/works these matters are not before me and I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of the information submitted.
10. In their statement the appellant advocated that they considered that the proposal would be permitted development. However, as I have found that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the wider area it was not necessary for me to consider whether a 'fall back' position existed.

Conditions

11. Paragraph 206 of the Framework sets out a number of tests that conditions need to meet. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against paragraph 206 and judge that they meet these tests. In addition to the standard time limit, for clarity and in the interests of the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, a condition requiring matching external materials to be used in the construction of the roof and dormers has been attached. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, I have also imposed a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

Jo Dowling

INSPECTOR