
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2019

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/19/3235432

33 Herlwyn Avenue, Ruislip HA4 6HE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Bhawani Singh Shekhawat against the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 73143/APP/2018/4089, is dated 13 November 2018.
 - The development proposed is conversion of existing roof space to allow 2 extra bedrooms and bathroom to be created and additional extension at ground floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused for conversion of existing roof space to allow 2 extra bedrooms and bathroom to be created and additional extension at ground floor level.

Procedural Matter

2. From the evidence I have before me, it is apparent that the proposed development was amended during the application to remove the dormer windows from the scheme. However, the appellant has indicated that they wish the originally submitted scheme which includes the dormer windows to be determined. I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a detached bungalow located within a residential area. The property is set back from the road and has a simple hipped roof form with a forward projection. The property has been extended to the side and rear with a wrap around flat roof extension.
5. Next door property No 35 has been extended with side, rear and roof extensions. However, most bungalows have a relatively straightforward design that, despite some differences, are in general harmony with each other in terms of their character and appearance. The forward projection is a characteristic feature of most bungalows.

6. The proposed side extension would extend the footprint of the dwelling flush with the existing forward projection. The scale and form of the extension would result in the loss of the characteristic forward projection, this combined with its flat roof design would draw the eye and represent an incongruous feature within the overall street scene, notwithstanding the set back from the road and arrangement and relationship with nearby properties.
7. The alterations to the roof would involve the insertion of two flat roof dormer windows in the side planes of the roof. The side dormers would be set in from the eaves, but not by a significant amount, and the ridge would be very close to that of the main roof. Whilst the dormers would not occupy the entire roof slopes, they would dominate the roof creating the appearance of an additional storey and would be visually prominent on account of their bulk and incongruous flat roof design.
8. As such, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area and therefore would be contrary to policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1: Strategic Policies (2012) which requires all new development to achieve a high quality of design which enhances the local distinctiveness of the area. It would also run counter to policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (2007) which overall seek to prevent development that fails to harmonise with, complement or improve the character and appearance of an area and that of the buildings within it. For similar reasons, the proposal would conflict with the objectives of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement – Residential Extensions'.
9. I note that other properties in the area have been altered. However, I am not aware of the individual circumstances that led to these other schemes being considered acceptable and every appeal must be considered on its own merits. The presence of other extensions in the area does not justify the harm that I have identified.
10. I note that the development would not impact on the living conditions of nearby occupiers in respect of light, overlooking, loss of privacy or overshadowing. However, the absence of harm in relation to these issues, counts neither for nor against the proposal, and does not alter the harm I have identified in relation to the main issues.
11. The appellant has suggested that the proposed development would improve the internal functional space. Whilst this is a personal benefit of the proposal, it is insufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified in relation to the main issues.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above the appeal is dismissed.

B Thandi

INSPECTOR