



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 September 2020 by Ben Phillips BSc MSc

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3254928

7 Park Avenue, Ruislip HA4 7UG

- 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 Jason Hicks against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 75201/APP/2020/394, dated 6 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 April 2020.
- The development proposed is described as the conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a rear dormer, 2 front dormers, 2 rooflights and conversion of both sides of roof from hip to gable end.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a rear dormer, 2 front dormers, 2 rooflights and conversion of both sides of roof from hip to gable end at 7 Park Avenue, Ruislip HA4 7UG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 75201/APP/2020/394, dated 6 February 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: Location Plan, 2079A.8 Rev. A.
 - 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.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. The description of development above is taken from the Council's Decision Notice and part E of the appeal form, in the interest of clarity.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area, with particular regard to the rear dormer.

Reasons for Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a detached bungalow, with accommodation in the roofspace, located prominently on the corner of Park Avenue and St Edmunds Avenue. Whilst Park Avenue is mostly characterised by detached two storey dwellings, St Edmunds Avenue is characterised by similar bungalows, many extended through dormer and roof extensions.
6. The extensive works proposed would substantially increase the massing of the roof plane, however the existing character of the dwelling as a modest property of traditional appearance would remain. The proposed front dormers are limited in scale and would sit comfortably within the expanded roof space. It is noteworthy that the Council has not raised concern in respect of these parts of the proposed development.
7. The rear dormer would be visible from Park Avenue and would be wider than two thirds of the rear roof space, which would conflict with part E (i) of Policy DMHD 1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) (LP). However, in that the new dormer window would be noticeably set in from the side elevations in addition to the ridge and eaves, and constructed of materials to match the host property I find that it would appear proportionate and subservient to the expanded roof which appears to be the purpose of this part of the policy. It would respect its character and appearance.
8. Furthermore, the proposal would be viewed in the context of nearby development, which includes a variety of roof forms with visible dormers evident in the street scene. Accordingly, I find that the rear dormer would not appear out of keeping nor incongruous within the appeal site's wider context.
9. In light of the foregoing, I conclude that the proposal would respect the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, in accordance with the aims of LP Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development proposals are of a high standard and that roof extensions are subservient to the existing roof.

Conditions

10. The Council has suggested the imposition of a condition relating to the start date of development, and in addition to requiring compliance with the application plans, I consider these to be appropriate in the interest of clarity. In addition, I agree that a condition requiring materials to match the existing original property is also necessary in the interest of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

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

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed with the conditions set out above.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR