

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2018

by David Fitzsimon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th August 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/18/3202446

42 Herlwyn Avenue, Ruislip HA4 6HD

- 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 Ms Olga Molokina against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 15887/APP/2018/756, dated 27 February 2018, was refused by notice dated 2 May 2018.
 - The development proposed is the *'conversion and extension of attached garage to provide single bedroom, wc and access to yard; alterations to the ground floor to allow conversion of the loft space to provide a bedroom and shower room; a new dormer to the west and replacement of the rear roof hip with a gable. New 'Velux' rooflights. Removal of existing chimney to below roof level'*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a hipped roof bungalow which sits in a road of broadly similar properties. The hipped roof nature of the majority of dwellings within the road is a noticeable feature of the street scene.
 4. The main external elements of the scheme include changing the hipped roof to a gable at the rear of the property, along with the introduction of a dormer to the side.
 5. To my mind, changing the hip to a gable at the rear of the property would not fundamentally alter its overall form, scale or proportions. This alteration would not be particularly noticeable from the public domain, where the hipped roof of the front of the property would remain prevalent. I also note that the rear roof at No. 46 Herlwyn Avenue finishes in a similar gable, which looks visually acceptable.
-

6. Although the flat roof dormer to be introduced to the side elevation of the host dwelling would be set well back from the front elevation, it would be as tall as the ridge of the host dwelling. This approach does not follow the advice contained within the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document titled '*Residential Extensions*' (SPD) which suggests that roof dormers to side elevations should be small in order to appear subordinate and should have '*a pitched or hipped roof over at the same angle to the main roof slope*'.
7. As a result, I consider that the dormer would appear as a bulky and ungainly addition, which would not sit comfortably against the hipped roof and modest proportions of the host dwelling. I am not satisfied that cladding the dormer in metal would fundamentally alter the harmful visual effect which would be readily visible within the street scene.
8. To this end, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits. In such terms, it conflicts with policy BE1 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies, policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 – Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies and the SPD; all of which seek to promote good design which is appropriate to its surroundings.
9. In reaching my decision, I note the presence of some similar flat roof dormers within Herlwyn Avenue, but these are the exception rather than the rule. Further, I do not know the precise planning circumstances behind them and they only reinforce the concerns I have outlined above.
10. The appellant also points to the fact that roof alterations could take place under the provisions of permitted development. However, I have considered the scheme before me on its merits and this does not prevent the appellant from exploring alternative proposals which either do or do not require planning permission with the Council in the first instance.
11. In conclusion, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits, contrary to the development plan policies and design guidance outlined above. The arguments advanced in favour of the scheme do not outweigh this harm and policy conflict, therefore the appeal does not succeed.

David Fitzsimon

INSPECTOR