



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2022

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3284150

20 Vine Lane, Uxbridge UB10 0AY

- 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 Harvey Purewal against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 21231/APP/2021/2152, dated 20 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as the "conversion of roof space of single storey rear element to use as a gym to include 6 dormers".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Officer's report details that consent has previously been granted for 3 dormer windows to the southern elevation. Nonetheless the description set out on the application form clearly refers to 6 dormers and the submitted plans do not refer to the consented 3 dormers. I have therefore determined the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, including the appeal property.

Reasons

4. Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) (the HLP), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) (the DMP), amongst other matters, seeks development that is of a high design quality and that contributes positively to the surrounding context. Detailed guidance regarding roof extensions is set out in Policy DMHD 1 of the DMP and details that, amongst other matters, "roof extensions should be located on the rear elevation only" and be subservient to the scale of the existing roof.
5. The single storey building to which the proposed dormers would be added is situated to the rear of the appeal property and projects parallel to the adjacent Chetwyn Drive. Consequently, the 3 proposed dormer windows to the southern elevation would be screened from the road and largely only visible from view points to the rear of the appeal property.

6. I saw at the site visit that the northern elevation of the existing building, while referred to as the rear elevation on the submitted plans, would nonetheless face on to Chetwyn Drive. The existing established trees to this boundary would provide some screening but the dormers would otherwise be visible from the street.
7. Furthermore, the submitted plans show that, as a result of the combination of the size, scale and number of the flat roofed dormers in proportion to the modest scale of the existing single storey building, the appeal scheme would fail to appear as subordinate to the existing property.
8. The appellant details that “the size and spacing of dormers have been designed to provide adequate separation between the dormers so that not to create one single bulk dormer”. Nonetheless, the submitted plans show that the dormers would dominate the existing roof structure.
9. For the reasons detailed above, I find that the appeal scheme would harm the character and appearance of the area including the appeal property contrary to Policy BE1 of the HLP and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD1 of the DMP.

Conclusion

10. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mr M Brooker

INSPECTOR

