



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2021

by Ian McHugh Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 November 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3270260
172 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 Gulman Singh Lakman against the decision of The London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 52114/APP/2020/3551, dated 2 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is single-storey rear extension, single-storey front extension, two-storey side extension, front and rear dormers, and the raising of the ridge height of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single-storey rear extension, single-storey front extension, two-storey side extension, front and rear dormers, and the raising of the ridge height of the property at 172 Harlington Road, Uxbridge, UB8 3HA, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 52114/APP/2020/3551, dated 2 November 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: Location Plan LP-601; Block Plan B-501; Site Plan Existing S-401; Plans Existing GA-102; Existing Elevations E-200; Site Plan Proposed S-402; and Proposed Elevations E-202, all dated 11 January 2021.
 - 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) Prior to the development being first brought into use, the ground-floor side windows facing number 174 Harlington Road shall be obscure glazed. The windows shall remain obscure glazed at all times throughout the life of the development.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the appeal was lodged, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021. In my opinion, this does not materially change the planning policy context in respect of the main issues.

The Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and on the character and appearance of the area. With particular regard to the proposed rear dormer.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling with dormers at the front and rear. The surrounding area is residential in character, with a mix of dwellings in terms of their age, size, and appearance. A number of properties, including the neighbouring dwelling at number 170 Harlington Road have dormers at first-floor level.
5. The proposal is essentially a resubmission of an earlier application that was approved by the Council on 10 June 2020 under reference 52114/APP/2020/1100. The main difference being that the appeal proposal seeks to construct larger dormers at the front and rear of the dwelling within a raised roof.
6. Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (LP1) seeks to achieve high-quality design and to conserve and enhance the Borough's environment. In addition, Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies (LP2) requires new development, including extensions to be of high-quality design that harmonises with local context. These policies are consistent with Paragraph 130 of the Framework, which requires developments to add to the overall quality of the area, be visually attractive, and to be sympathetic to local character.
7. The Council considers that the development to be acceptable, with the exception of the proposed rear dormer. I have no reason to disagree with the Council's assessment of the other aspects, which I consider to be acceptable in terms of their design, scale and impact on neighbouring properties.
8. With regard to the rear dormer, the Council states that it would be an insubordinate and incongruous form of development, because of its overall size and mass. It considers that it would fail to respect the proportions of the roof and it would be readily visible from neighbouring rear gardens. The Council refers to Policy DMHD 1 of LP2, which (amongst other things) specifies requirements in terms of the size and position of roof extensions.
9. Although the rear dormer would be a large structure and would be significantly larger than the rear dormer extension approved by the Council in 2020, I am not persuaded that it would be unacceptably harmful to the appearance of the dwelling or to the character of the area. Whilst it could not be described as being subordinate, the plans show that the dormer would be set-down 1.5m from the proposed ridge of the roof, inset from the sides of the property by 87cm and 45cm above the eaves at the rear. Consequently, the form and appearance of the main roof will be evident. Furthermore, the dormer would not be visible in the streetscene and views from nearby rear gardens would be limited, due to the separation distances between the dwellings and intervening vegetation.
10. Therefore, whilst I consider that there would be some conflict with the Development Plan, mainly because of its width, this is outweighed by the

material considerations detailed above and the absence of any significant harm.

Conditions

11. The Council has suggested conditions in the event of the appeal being allowed. I have included these in my decision. In addition to the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development; the list of approved plans; and the use of matching materials, I have imposed a condition requiring obscure glazing to be fitted to the two ground-floor windows facing number 174 Harlington Road. This has been referred to in the Council Officer's report and I consider it to be necessary to protect the privacy of the occupants of the neighbouring dwelling.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be allowed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR