
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2017

by Jason Whitfield BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3164125
44 Warren Road, Ickenham UB10 8AD

- 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 Maisam Ali Fazal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 17392/APP/2016/2894, dated 26 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is conversion of the loft to habitable space and creating a rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. It was evident from my site visit that the dormer window has been constructed. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis that the development has already occurred.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Warren Road is characterised by large, detached houses sited upon substantial plots. Set back from a leafy, verdant avenue, the properties vary in design and have generous front gardens. This contributes to the suburban character of the area. The appeal property is a detached two-storey dwelling constructed largely in red brick with a tiled, pitched roof. The property has a long rear garden and has been extended with a two-storey rear extension, single storey extension and a rear conservatory.
 5. The appeal relates to the erection of a dormer window on the rear roof slope of the property. The Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions 2008 (SPD) states at paragraph 7.4 that roof extensions should relate well to the proportions, roof forms and massing of the existing house and its neighbours. Paragraph 7.5 of the SPD states that an extension should appear secondary to the size of the roof face within which it will be set. SPD paragraph 7.7 states that dormer windows should be constructed in the centre of the roof and should be set in at
-

least 1m from the sides of the roof, 0.3m below the ridge and 0.5m back from the eaves.

6. I note that the dormer is set back from the eaves, set in from the sides of the roof and set down from the ridge. However, it is set in just 0.2m from the sides of the roof, is only marginally below the ridge and minimally set back from the eaves. It therefore obscures the majority of the rear roof slope of the property and, whilst I recognise it incorporates matching materials, the dormer nevertheless appears as an unduly bulky and dominant addition.
7. Whilst the dormer is to the rear of the property and therefore set back from Warren Road, it is nevertheless visible to an extent from vantage points within the street scene due to the spacing between the appeal property and the dwellings either side. Although the full extent and mass of the dormer is not perceptible, it nonetheless presents as an obtrusive and incongruous addition to the property and the wider street scene.
8. I conclude, therefore, that the development has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. As a consequence, it conflicts with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies 2012 which states that new development should improve and maintain the quality of the built environment. It would also conflict with Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 – Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies 2012 which state that development must harmonise with the existing street scene, that extensions should harmonise with the original building and that development should complement the character of the area. It would also conflict with the guidance set out in the SPD.

Other Matters

9. The appellant refers to a fallback position whereby a dormer extension could be erected up to a size of 50m³ under permitted development rights. It is indicated that a 10m³ gable extension was made to the original roof in the 1960s. The dormer subject of this appeal is around 42m³. Thus, the dormer would not be permitted development as the resulting roof space would exceed the cubic content of the original roof space by more than 50m³.
10. Nevertheless, the appellant argues that if the appeal were dismissed, there is every likelihood that a dormer extension within the 50m³ allowance would be built under permitted development rights. I recognise that such a dormer would serve a similar purpose to the appeal development. However, whilst such a dormer would look similar, in the absence of any details of the construction of the fallback position, it is reasonable to consider that it would likely be reduced in its scale and massing in comparison to the appeal development. As such, it would be less harmful than the appeal proposal. I therefore afford the fallback position little weight.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jason Whitfield

INSPECTOR