



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 6 July 2021

by Tamsin Law BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3270895

25 Angle Close, Uxbridge UB10 0BS

- 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 Mrs Kuldip Lachhar against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 13998/APP/2020/3529, dated 16 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is part two storey, part single storey rear extension, single storey side extension and conversion of garage to habitable use, including demolition of conservatory. Loft conversion with small dormer windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for part two storey, part single storey rear extension, single storey side extension and conversion of garage to habitable use, including demolition of conservatory. Loft conversion with small dormer windows at 25 Angle Close, Uxbridge UB10 0BS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 13998/APP/2020/3529, dated 16 November 2020, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall not begin later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 25 ACL/P2/01, 25 ACL/P2/04 A and 25 ACL/P2/06
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the dormer window on the southern (side) elevation has been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of that window 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.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council confirm in their delegated report that the part two storey, part single storey rear extension, single storey side extension and conversion of garage to habitable use, including demolition of the conservatory and alterations to the main roof have received planning permission and are subject to extant consents. The Council have confirmed that they have only assessed the addition of the dormer windows and roof lights in determining the

application. I have reviewed the plans which only detail the addition of dormer windows and rooflights as a difference between the existing and proposed plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the dormer windows on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached two-storey dwelling located within a predominantly residential area and is sited in the corner of a cul-de-sac. The dwellings in Angle Close vary in design, however many have dominant projected gables and dormer windows to their front elevations.
5. Due to the host dwelling's projecting gable and its location in the corner of a cul-de-sac, the far side of the dwelling is not readily visible when travelling through Angle Close towards the site. One dormer window would be located to the rear and one to the side. The proposed dormer windows are modest in scale in relation to the host dwelling with the side dormers being set back from the front of the property and both dormers being set down from the ridge.
6. Although the proposed side dormer would be visible when stood in front of the dwelling it would not be so conspicuous so as to be a visually prominent form of development that would materially alter the character and appearance of the street scene or host dwelling. The assimilation of the proposal into the existing street scene and host dwelling would be assisted by the use of windows and roof tiles to match those of the host property.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the area. It would not conflict with Local Plan Part 1¹ Policy BE1 or Local Plan Part 2² Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development harmonises with the local context and considers the character and quality of the surrounding area. The proposed development would also comply with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

8. Third parties have raised concern about the potential for overlooking of their garden from the proposed side dormer window. I accept that the addition of the dormer windows could increase overlooking. Therefore, as it is high level and would be used for light into a stairwell and a bedroom, where a further window and roof light would be provided, I see no reason why the side dormer window could not be obscure glazed. This would mitigate any overlooking and thus there would be no loss of privacy from the side dormer window.

Conditions

9. In the interests of proper planning and for the avoidance of doubt, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development be carried out in

¹ London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 – Strategic Policies (November 2012)

² London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies (January 2020)

accordance with the approved plans. I note that the plans were altered during the course of the application and the plan numbers have remained the same. However, both the appellant and the Council have confirmed that their assessment was based on the plans detailing two dormer windows not three and I have determined the appeal on those plans.

10. In order to safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring residents, a condition will also be attached to ensure the two side dormer windows are obscure glazed. The appellant has outlined the acceptability of such a condition in their grounds of appeal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Tamsin Law

INSPECTOR

