



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2019

**by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 27th November 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3236452**

**111 Lime Grove, Ruislip HA4 8RW**

- 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 Dave Bloomfield against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref: 25120/APP/2019/1684, dated 18 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2019.
  - The development proposed is the conversion of the roofspace to habitable use to include a rear dormer, 2 front dormers and the conversion of the roof from hip to gable ends, with two gable end windows.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the conversion of the roofspace to habitable use to include a rear dormer, 2 front dormers and the conversion of the roof from hip to gable ends, with two gable end windows at 111 Lime Grove, Ruislip HA4 8RW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25120/APP/2019/1684, dated 18 May 2019, 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: Site Location Plan Scale 1:1250, 01 Existing Floor Plans, 02 Rev A Existing/Proposed Elevations, 03 Rev A Existing/Proposed Elevations, 04 Proposed Ground Floor Plan, 05 Rev A Proposed Loft Floor Plan.
  - 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.
  - 4) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the windows on the side elevations at first floor level have been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of those windows that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Details of the type of obscured glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the windows are installed and once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.

## **Main Issue**

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

## **Reasons**

3. The appeal property is an extended detached bungalow with a roof that is predominantly hipped in form. It is situated on a corner plot where Lime Grove meets Kent Gardens. There are a variety of house types in the area, with both hipped and gable ended roofs. Dormers are also found on a number of properties, on both front and rear elevations.
4. The proposed hip to gable conversion is not in dispute between the main parties and I see no reason to disagree as it would not appear out of place with the differing roof types that are found in the area. The size of the proposed 2 front dormers would appear in proportion to the resultant scale of the front roof slope. They would be well spaced apart, set in from the sides of the roof, and set off both the eaves and ridge levels. Their pitched roof design would be in keeping with the property. When these factors are taken together, they would not be unduly visually prominent when viewed from Lime Grove or Kent Gardens.
5. The proposed rear dormer, whilst larger in size and box-like in its design, would also be well set off the sides of the roof, as well as from the eaves and ridge levels. Furthermore, it would be partially positioned behind a pitched roof rear element on the existing property. Accordingly, it would not appear overly dominant when viewed from the rear of the property or the Kent Gardens streetscene. Overall, the architectural composition of the proposal would accord with the dwelling and its location.
6. The Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2008) (SPD) states that, as regards the position of dormers on roof slopes on properties that are most akin to the appeal dwelling, that set-ins should be at least one metre. Both the proposed front and rear dormers would achieve this distance, or be close to it. As a consequence, they would appear secondary to the size of the roof faces and so accord with the thrust of the guidance in the SPD.
7. I conclude that the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would comply with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012) and with Saved Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Unitary Development Plan (1998)<sup>1</sup> which, collectively, seek to ensure a high quality of design, for development to harmonise with the streetscene and original building, and for new development within residential areas to complement or improve the amenity and character of the area. It would also comply with the SPD as it would appear subordinate and in scale to the original building.

## **Other Matters**

8. The proposal would be on the opposite side of the road from the nearest residential properties on Kent Gardens. With the distance in between and its proportions, the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the outlook

---

<sup>1</sup> Also referred to as the Local Plan: Part 2 - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (2012)

and light from these properties, including to the rooms and windows that face towards the side of the appeal site. In relation to the privacy levels and the use of their front garden areas, the proposed small first floor window in the facing side elevation would be obscurely glazed. The proposed dormer windows would face over the appeal property's own garden and Lime Grove, not directly towards the properties to the side on Kent Gardens. Concerning construction related disruption, this would only be likely for a short duration, with the householder extension nature of the proposal. The effect on the living conditions would not be unacceptable.

9. I have been made aware that the proposal is an amended scheme, following an earlier refusal of planning permission. Nevertheless, it is to be determined on its own merits and, for the reasons that I have set out, it is not unacceptable.

### **Conditions**

10. As well as the time limit condition (1), I have imposed a condition in the interests of certainty in relation to the approved plans (2). I have also imposed conditions concerning matching materials to the existing property in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area (3), and the obscure glazing of the proposed first floor windows in the side elevations for the purposes of protecting the privacy levels of the occupiers of the nearest residential properties (4).

### **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all matters raised, the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions.

*Darren Hendley*

INSPECTOR