



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: 2 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3253967

50 St Martins Approach, Ruislip, Middlesex HA4 7QQ

- 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 & Mrs W James against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 26449/APP/2020/831, dated 7 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as form new dormer window on front of dwelling and install velux windows on side and rear elevation in conjunction with a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted to form new dormer window on front of dwelling and install velux windows on side and rear elevation in conjunction with a loft conversion at 50 St Martins Approach, Ruislip, Middlesex HA4 7QQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 26449/APP/2020/831, dated 7 March 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: WJ/02/19, WJ/01/19 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.
 - 4) The windows in the approved dormer shall be fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of that/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 window is installed and once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons for Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a traditional two storey detached dwelling, located on a pleasant suburban residential street characterised by detached two storey dwellings of varying appearance but traditional character. Most of the properties have front facing gables, and there are examples of dormer extensions visible.
5. The proposed dormer would be located on the side of the front facing gable and would be set behind the existing chimney, set back from the front of the dwelling. The gable itself is set down from the main ridge of the property and the dormer would be set in from the eaves of the gable. Given this set back and the limited scale of the dormer, its visual impact would be minor. It would not dominate or substantially compromise the existing character of the roof or property.
6. There are numerous examples of similarly sized and sited dormers and roof lights/velux windows within the nearby street scene. As such the proposed dormer and velux windows would not appear out of keeping nor incongruous within the wider context.
7. Given its siting, I acknowledge that there would be a degree of conflict with part E (i) of Policy DMHD 1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) which states that roof extensions should be located on the rear elevation only. The wording of the policy does not however prevent roof extensions elsewhere on a property and given my findings above there would be no conflict the overall aims of this policy which seeks to support good design, amongst other matters.
8. In light of the foregoing, I conclude that the proposal would not detract from the character or appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. There is therefore no conflict with Policy BE1 of the Local Plan Part 1 Strategic Policies (2012) or the aims of Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) (LP) 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.

Other Matters

9. The proposed dormer would include two small side facing windows serving a staircase which would face towards the side elevation of No 48 St Martins Approach. These are shown to be obscure glazed, and this matter could be controlled by an appropriately worded planning condition.
10. Roof lights are also proposed on the northern side and rear elevations. Given the small scale and high level of the side elevation rooflights, I consider that their position would not result in a loss of privacy to the occupiers of No 52. The rear facing roof lights would also be high level and would be unlikely to result in a loss of privacy to the rear gardens of the adjoining occupiers to the degree that would be harmful to their occupiers' living conditions.
11. In light of the foregoing I conclude that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, in accordance with part B of LP Policy DMHB11.

Conditions

12. The Council has suggested the imposition of a condition requiring compliance with the application plans which I consider necessary 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. In addition, a condition requiring the windows of the dormer to be obscure glazed is necessary, in the interest of preventing overlooking of no 48.

Conclusion

13. 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

14. 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