The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2019

by Adrian Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3226183
63 Parkfield Avenue, Hillingdon, Uxbridge UB10 0DG

- 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 J Sapra against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 13587/APP/2018/3722, dated 20 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 14 January 2019.
- The development proposed is a rear dormer extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear dormer extension at 63 Parkfield Avenue, Hillingdon, Uxbridge UB10 0DG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 13587/APP/2018/3722, dated 20 October 2018, and the plans submitted with it, 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: Drw No P6301 Rev B, Drw No P6303 Rev B.

    3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is one half of a pair of two-storey semi-detached houses on the western side of Parkfield Avenue. It has a two-storey side extension and a flat roof rear dormer window. The existing dormer is set comfortably within the roof slope, approximately 745mm below the ridge, 300mm above the eaves and 4.5m from the gable end flank, according to the submitted plans. The adjoining property No 65 has a similar two storey side extension and two pitched roof rear dormers. Nos 67 and 69 both have considerable box dormers that occupy almost the whole of their rear roof slopes.

4. The proposal would extend the existing rear dormer on No 63 by roughly 1.3m at the same height and in matching materials, but without any further

windows. Proportionally, this would be a small addition in relation to the existing dormer and rear roof as a whole. Because the roof of the side extension continues the plane of the original roof, the extended and original roof appear visually as one and should be treated as such in terms of compliance with the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions (2008) (the SPD). This means the dormer extension would be set in from the gable end flank by approximately 3.2m. Accordingly, it could not be regarded as an over-dominant addition to the rear roof slope, particularly when appreciated in the same context as those at Nos 67 and 69. Furthermore, the rear is generally concealed from wider public views, and the considerable set-in distance from the flank would ensure that the development could not be seen from Parkfield Avenue. As such, it would also be unobtrusive in views from the surrounding area.

5. I acknowledge that there is a breach of the SPD in respect of the recommended distance from the eaves, but this is only by 200mm and already exists. Moreover, an extended dormer which complied with the recommended eaves distance would look incongruous juxtaposed with the larger existing dormer. The recommended set-in distances from the ridgeline and flank are exceeded. As a whole, the development would not have the appearance of a flat roof third storey, like those at 67 and 69, which is what the SPD guidance is ultimately seeking to avoid. I therefore find no significant conflict with the underlying aims of the SPD guidance.

6. Consequently, the development would be acceptable in terms of its impact on the character and appearance of the building and area. As such, the proposal does not conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), and Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012) in this regard. Collectively, these policies seek to ensure that extensions are compatible with the existing building and do not damage the character of the area.

Conditions

7. I have imposed the standard time limit condition as well as a condition that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. These are considered necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I also consider a condition requiring the external materials to match the existing dwelling is necessary in the interests of local character and appearance.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Adrian Caines

INSPECTOR