



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 September 2020 by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3253274

75 Collins Drive, Ruislip HA4 9EG

- 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 Tharmalingam Manoharan against the decision the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 9557/APP/2020/808, dated 4 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as "proposed part single part double storey side and rear extension, roof extension following rear dormer and front roof slope windows following demolition of existing side and rear conservatory".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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 is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the pair of semi-detached dwellings of which it forms part, and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal relates to a two-storey, semi-detached, hipped roofed dwelling, located within a residential area. The appeal dwelling has a two-storey hipped roofed extension to the side, which is set down from the main ridge, and a single storey conservatory that wraps around the side and rear elevations.
 5. The proposal includes a two-storey side/rear extension, which would project along the full depth of the original dwelling and extend beyond the original rear elevation. The rear part of the two-storey extension would have a pitched roof and would be set down from the main ridge. The proposal also includes a single storey, flat-roofed rear extension, front roof lights, and a rear dormer.
 6. Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2, specifically requires that new extensions appear subordinate to the main dwelling in various ways including in terms of their height. The pre-ambles to the policy explain that two-storey side extensions on detached and semi-detached houses should be set back
-

- from the main front wall of the dwelling by at least one metre to provide definition between the original house and the extension. Similarly, roofs of side extensions should be set back from the front roof plane so that their ridges are lower than the main ridge to ensure that the addition reads as a subordinate element.
7. The existing two-storey side/rear extension, whilst projecting slightly forward of the main part of the front elevation, is set down from the ridge line of the pair which enables it to be read as a subservient addition. The proposal seeks to increase the height of this part of the building to that of the main dwelling, as such increasing its bulk and massing. The cumulative impact of the existing and proposed extensions, which without set down from the ridge or set back from the frontage would result in a visually sizeable extension, would not be subordinate to the host dwelling.
 8. I acknowledge that the extension has been designed to reflect the form and materials of the host dwelling and that because of the existing extension, the symmetry of the pair has already been eroded. Nevertheless, the current set down from ridge height allows the original form and massing of the pair of properties to remain legible. The loss of that set down would mean that the host property would become disproportionate in terms of its size and appearance as part of the pair. As such the proposal would exacerbate the visual imbalance.
 9. Given the prominent position of the appeal site within the streetscene, the dominant appearance of the development would be clearly visible. The extension would not harmonise with the scale of the host dwelling and the proposed design would also affect the appearance of the pair of semi-detached properties. Thus, the development would be harmful to the appearance of the existing dwelling, the pair of semi-detached dwellings of which it forms part, and the street scene.
 10. The flat roofed rear dormer would have a box-like form and would project along most of the width of the original roof of the dwelling. Notwithstanding the set down from the main ridge, set in from the adjoining dwelling, and set up from the eaves level, the dormer would cover a significant proportion of the rear slope of the dwelling and would form a top heavy, dominant feature that would not reflect the style or form of the original roof.
 11. The dormer would not appear out of context when viewed in relation to the large rear dormers of the neighbouring properties, and given its secluded position to the rear, the impact on the character and appearance of the street scene would be neutral. Nevertheless, this does not negate the harmful impact that the dormer would have on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
 12. The appellant has drawn my attention to a scheme¹ that has been allowed at appeal. The Inspector in that case noted that the dormer would be positioned within an extensive roof plane because of a previous extension. That is not the case in the appeal before me. Notwithstanding the similarities between the design of this scheme and the proposal before me, given my findings above, the appeal development is not directly comparable to this scheme. Thus, I

¹ APP/R5510/D/18/3218859

attach limited weight to it and have determined the proposal in light of the site specific circumstances of this case.

13. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the pair of dwellings of which it forms part, and the street scene. Therefore, the development would be contrary to the objectives of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies, and Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies, which collectively require, amongst other things, that developments respect the scale of the original house and have no adverse impact on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area.

Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andreea Spataru

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR