



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2021

by Julie Dale Clark BA (Hons) DipTP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3267357

15 Linden Avenue, Ruislip HA4 8TW

- 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 and Mrs Newman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 43635/APP/2020/3537, dated 30 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is conversion of loft space to form habitable accommodation with rear dormer and increase in ridge height.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider that the main issue is the effect of the rear dormer and increasing the ridge height on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a mid-terraced two-storey house and the proposal would involve raising the ridge and erecting a large dormer extension in the roof slope. There are slightly varying ridge heights reflecting the change in land levels along Linden Avenue and I note that other houses have raised ridges and rear dormers. I do not have the full details of these developments but in my view, they are large, bulky and at odds with the design of their respective houses and the area generally. I do however I accept that dormer extensions feature in the locality in varying forms.
4. Whilst raising the roof height of No 15 may be relatively modest, the total effect of the raised roof and the large dormer which would be approximately at the level of the new ridge height and would take up much of the rear roof elevation, would introduce a substantial feature at an elevated level. It would make the house appear somewhat top heavy and dominant. It would not be in keeping with the design or overall appearance of the existing house or the terrace.
5. Despite the varying roof heights and dormers in the area, I do not consider that they justify allowing this proposal which I consider would be an overwhelming addition, of poor design that would be of a size and scale that

would be bulky in appearance. Local Plan Part 1 Policy BE1¹ and Local Plan Part 2 Policy DMHB 11² require a high standard of design in all new buildings, alterations and extensions. I do not consider that the proposal is of the standard of design to satisfy these policies.

6. Furthermore, Local Plan Part 2 Policy DMHD 1 specifically refers to alterations and extensions to residential dwellings including roof extensions. This explains that roof extensions should be subservient to the scale of the existing roof and not exceed more than two-thirds of the average width of the original roof; they should be located below the ridge and retain a substantial element of the original roof slope above the eaves line. It also indicates that raising the main roof above the existing ridgeline will not be supported. The proposal clearly conflicts with this policy.
7. I have taken all matters into consideration but none alter my conclusion. I conclude that the proposed dormer and increasing the ridge height would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and conflict with the policies referred to above. The appeal therefore fails.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR

¹ London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies (Adopted November 2012).

² London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies, Adopted Version 16 January 2020.