
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2020

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 14 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3255041
178 Harlington Road, Uxbridge UB8 3HA

- 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 Sailesh Bika against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 45917/APP/2020/917, dated 16 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as an alteration to the existing loft conversion incorporating new dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposal on the existing building and its surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this detached bungalow which is located within a residential area. The area contains a mixture of single and 2 storey properties many of which have been extended in some form. The existing bungalow has a roof with a central ridge which runs front-to-rear with gables at the front and rear. It has rooms within the roof space, which are served by roof-lights and windows within the gables.
4. The proposal would result in 4 new dormer windows, 2 each in both of the side roof slopes. The dormers would be of the same size and would measure 4.45m in width.
5. Policy DMHB 11 of the Council's Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (DMP) requires that new development, including extensions, should be designed to the highest standards, taking account of scale and mass so that it harmonises with the locality. Policy DMHD 1 of the DMP sets out detailed requirements for residential extensions. In relation to roof extensions it states that these should be located at the rear only and should be subservient, not exceeding two-thirds of the width of the original roof.
6. The proposed dormers would be clearly visible from the front of the dwelling, within the street-scene. Their considerable combined length would be apparent

in views along the sides of the property. Although the dormers would be set down from the ridge and set away from the sides of the roof, I consider that, in combination, they would appear large, cumbersome and would not appear subservient to the existing roof. I appreciate that some of the detailed requirements set out in detail in Policy DMHD 1 would be satisfied but these requirements relate to roof extensions at the rear of properties and the fact that this would not be at the rear means that it is contrary to the requirements of that policy. As a result, the proposal would have an unacceptable appearance in relation to the dwelling and would harm the street-scene generally, contrary to both policies set out above.

7. The appellant states that it would be possible to construct dormer windows here without the need for planning permission. However, I have not been provided with any drawings of such a scheme and I have not been made aware of any applications for a Certificate of Lawfulness which would confirm this. In these circumstances, I attach only limited weight to the appellant's statement in this respect.
8. For the reasons set out above, the proposal conflicts with relevant policies in the DMP and would cause harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. I find that there is no overriding benefit that would arise from the proposal which is sufficient to outweigh this harm. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR