The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2017

by AJ Steen BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 8 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3172004
10 Kings College Road, Ruislip HA4 8BH

- 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 & Mrs Heanen against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 39712/APP/2016/4248, dated 23 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 January 2017.
- The development proposed is loft conversion with rear dormer.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for loft conversion with rear dormer at 10 Kings College Road, Ruislip HA4 8BH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 39712/APP/2016/4248, dated 23 November 2016, subject to the following conditions:

    1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

    2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 16-014 LP, 16-014 P-01, 16-014 P-02, 16-014 P-03, 16-014 P-05 Revision A, 16-014 P-06 Revision A, 16-014 P-07.

    3) 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed loft conversion with rear dormer on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. 10 Kings College Road is located in a row of detached houses originally of similar design within an area containing a mix of detached and semi-detached houses and bungalows. Of those similar houses in the row, a number have been extended in differing ways, including conversion of the hipped side roofs to gable ends in order to provide space within the loft.

4. A Certificate of Lawfulness of Proposed Use or Development (CLOPUD) has been issued by the Council for the conversion of the roof of 10 Kings College

Road with a gable end to either side replacing the existing hipped ends and a large flat roofed dormer to the rear. This would retain a small pitched roof over the side projection adjacent to the single storey garage. 8 Kings College Road has been extended in a similar manner.

5. The proposal would result in a similar extension, but would extend over that side projection, such that it would provide a tall front elevation over that part of the building. Whilst the solution proposed by the CLOPUD would be more elegant and attractive, the loft conversion at 4 Kings College Road has been completed in a similar manner. As a result, the appearance of the proposed development from the road would reflect the design and appearance of development within the immediate surroundings.

6. The substantial dormer to the rear would extend across most of the rear of the revised roof. This would be visible from rear gardens of surrounding dwellings, but would not be easily visible from public vantage points. As such, the effect of the proposed dormer would be limited. The dwelling at 6 Kings College Road also has a dormer window across most of the rear roof and that at no. 4 has two slightly smaller dormers. As a result, the proposed dormer would reflect the design and appearance of surrounding development.

7. The Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions resists dormer roof extensions across the width of the house and that create the appearance of a flat roofed third storey. The proposed flat roof would be close to the ridge, although would not conflict with guidance relating to distance to the side and eaves. However, the proximity to the ridge would reflect the design of dormer windows on neighbouring properties and that of the CLOPUD, which would outweigh that limited conflict with the SPD.

8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed loft conversion and dormer would reflect the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area. As such, it would not conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies and Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan that seek to improve or maintain the quality of the built environment, through high quality design of development and that development should complement or improve the character of the area.

Conditions

9. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. A condition is necessary for materials to match those used on the existing house to maintain the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons and taking into account all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

AJ Steen

INSPECTOR