
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 November 2017

by Oliver Blower MA (T&CP)

a person appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3179579
278 Victoria Road, Ruislip HA4 0DP

- 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 Slavin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 13043/APP/2017/578, dated 17 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 18 April 2017.
 - The development is described as "proposed loft conversion".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the loft conversion at 278 Victoria Road, Ruislip HA4 0DP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 13043/APP/2017/578, dated 17 February 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 3818/01 and the Location Plan.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. I note that the Council consider the proposed development acceptable with respect to its effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and, from my own observations, I see no reason to disagree. I therefore consider the main issue to be the effect of the loft conversion on the character and appearance of the host building and immediate area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a two-storey mid-terrace house. Permitted development rights were removed from the dwelling following planning permission for the erection of the adjacent attached house, 42 Sidmouth Drive. The immediate area is residential in character, being primarily composed of terraced houses, several of which have rear dormer windows visible from Sidmouth Drive.
-

4. The development plan includes the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies, November 2012 ('LP') and the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – UDP Saved Policies, November 2012 ('LP saved policies').
5. Policy BE1 of the LP seeks to ensure, in part, that all new development should achieve a high quality of design in all new buildings, alterations and extensions and the public realm, which enhances the local distinctiveness of the area and contributes to community cohesion and a sense of place.
6. LP saved policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 seek to ensure, amongst other matters, that the layout and appearance of new development should harmonise with the existing street scene or other features of the area, and with the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the original building; and complements or improves the character of the area.
7. Further guidance is given in the Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions (SPD). This recommends, amongst other things, that it is important to create an extension that will appear secondary to the size of the roof face within which it will be set. Roof extensions that would be as wide as the house and create the appearance of an effective flat roofed third-storey will be refused permission; a dormer window or roof extension must be constructed in the centre of the roof face, and a flat roof will normally be acceptable for a rear dormer.
8. The proposal is for a rear dormer window approximately 4.8m wide, located in the centre of the roof slope, set in 0.5m from both sides of the house, down 0.3m from the ridge of the roof and up 1m from the eaves. These features, together, ensure the dormer window would not appear bulky or dominant, but rather secondary to the size of the roof face, thereby achieving an appropriate degree of subservience to the house. In addition, by virtue of its appropriate scale, it would not appear as a flat roofed third-storey but rather as a typical roof feature of its suburban location, thus preserving the residential character of the immediate area.
9. As a result, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the character or appearance of the host building or immediate area. As such, it would accord with LP policy BE1, LP saved policies BE13, BE15 and BE19, and advice in the SPD. I therefore allow the appeal.

O Blower

Appointed Person