



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2017

by J Gilbert MA (Hons) MTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 07 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/17/3172905 92A Glebe Avenue, Ickenham UB10 8PD

- 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 Alexander Teasdale against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 15512/APP/2017/54, dated 4 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 16 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a rear dormer and 4 front rooflights and conversion from 1 x 2-bed flat to 1 x 1-bed flat and 1 x studio flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a rear dormer and 4 front rooflights and conversion from 1 x 2-bed flat to 1 x 1-bed flat and 1 x studio flat at 92A Glebe Avenue, Ickenham UB10 8PD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 15512/APP/2017/54, dated 4 January 2017, subject to the following 6 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 approved plans listed as follows: A-10-001; A-19-010; A-19-101; A-19-110; A- 19-201; A-19-202; A-19-301; A-19-302.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the new dwelling hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing property, No 92A Glebe Avenue.
 - 4) No part of the proposed development shall be first occupied until facilities for the storage of cycles and household refuse have been provided, in the locations shown on plan A-19-010, and in accordance with further details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The storage facilities shall be retained thereafter.
 - 5) Within three months of the date of this approval, details of a sound proofing scheme, certified or to the certifiable standards of the Association of Noise Consultants (ANC) or UK Accreditation Services (UKAS), between first and second floors shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval and shall be implemented prior to occupation of the residential units hereby approved.
 - 6) No part of the proposed development shall be first occupied until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary

treatments to be provided. The boundary treatments thus approved shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details, prior to the first occupation of either of the proposed residential units.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the description of the proposal from the Council's decision notice and the appellant's appeal form. It adequately and simply describes the proposed development instead of the much longer and more detailed description given on the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a mid-terraced building within a small two-storey shopping parade, with retail units at ground floor level and flats above. The parade lies in a predominantly residential area characterised by two-storey semi-detached houses, some of which have been extended at roof level. The rear of the appeal site faces a vehicular access between Glebe Avenue and residential properties on Clovelly Avenue and Clovelly Close.
5. The proposed development involves the conversion of the existing first floor two-bedroom flat into 2 flats. The Council has not contended the size and layout of the proposed flats. With the soundproofing of floors between the proposed studio and one bedroom units, I consider that the flat conversion of the existing flat to 2 smaller flats would be acceptable. The Council is also content with the appearance of the 4 proposed rooflights on the front roofslope of the building. Given their modest size and limited effect on the appearance of the roofslope, I consider that these rooflights would not harm the character and appearance of the area. The sole area of dispute between the appellant and the Council relates to the proposed rear dormer window.
6. As a result of the setting in of the dormer off the ridge, eaves, and side boundaries, the proposed dormer window would appear secondary to the original building and would not create the appearance of a flat roofed third-storey. Despite the appeal property not being a house, the proposed dormer window's position within the roofslope would accord with the requirements for dormer windows to terraced houses set out by the Council in the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Extensions (2008).
7. Although the proposed windows to the dormer would not be aligned with the smaller windows on the first floor of the building, there are other examples of large dormers in the surrounding residential area of Glebe Avenue and Clovelly Close where the dormer windows are either not aligned with the windows below or are larger than the first floor windows. The proposed fenestration in itself does not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, the windows at roof level within the proposed development would be a sufficient distance from neighbouring occupiers on Clovelly Avenue and Clovelly Close to prevent overlooking and loss of privacy.
8. In addition to concerns about the effect of the proposed dormer window on the character and appearance of the area, the neighbouring occupier at No 6 Clovelly Close has raised other issues. Matters relating to drainage, means of escape and

the safety of the proposed stairwell would be addressed by Building Regulations. Additionally, the Council has confirmed that the internal and external space for the proposed flats and their parking provision is acceptable. While I have limited evidence on these matters, I see no reason to disagree with their findings. Furthermore, in my opinion, the site has reasonable access to public transport. As it is within walking and cycling distance of Ickenham tube station and bus services, it would not be necessary for the occupants of the proposed flats to use a car to access day to day services.

9. For the reasons set out above, I consider that the proposed dormer window would not have a detrimental effect on the architectural quality of the existing building and it would not look out of place within the street scene. Therefore I conclude that it would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would not be contrary to the design objectives of policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies 2012, policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies 2012, and the HDAS.
10. Policy BE1 requires all new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment. Policy BE13 states that the layout and appearance of development must harmonise with the existing street scene, while policy BE15 requires development to respect the scale, form and proportions of the original building. Policy BE19 looks to ensure that new developments complement or improve the amenity and character of the locality. The HDAS sets out requirements for extensions in Hillingdon.

Conclusion

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

Conditions

12. The Council has put forward a condition relating to sound proofing between units. I agree that this condition is necessary to safeguard the living conditions of occupiers of the first floor flat, but have amended the proposed wording to define which floors of the building would be affected by the condition and to require the works to take place prior to occupation of both residential units.
13. In addition to this condition, I consider it necessary to specify conditions limiting the lifespan of the planning permission, confirming the approved plans, refuse and cycle storage, boundary treatments, and the materials for the proposed development. All of these conditions are required to ensure certainty, with the conditions on materials, boundary treatments, and refuse and cycle storage also ensuring that the appearance of the development is satisfactory and that the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers are maintained.

J Gilbert

INSPECTOR