
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 March 2019

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th March 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3219971
128 Hoylake Crescent, Ickenham, UB10 8JH

- 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 Hirani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 15585/APP/2018/3673, dated 15 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 12 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension incorporating side dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension incorporating side dormers in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 15585/APP/2018/3673, dated 15 October 2018, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: Drg No AG/AC/128/18 LOFT.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. There is an extant planning permission that was given on appeal in July 2016 (Ref APP/R5510/D/16/3151560) for extensions to the rear that are equivalent to those proposed as part of this appeal. Considering this, and having regard also to the reason given for the refusal, the main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed side dormer windows on the character and appearance of 128 Hoylake Crescent and the wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, detached dwelling set within a sub-urban road comprising a mix of property types but with many of similar age and appearance. However, No 128 stands out as unique due to its taller proportions, atypical Dutch hipped roof orientated front to back, and dormer windows to the front and one side. The proposal would include replacing the existing blank-faced side dormer with a larger, more traditional looking flat roofed dormer, and to construct a similar dormer on the opposing side roof slope.
4. Section 7 of the *Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document - Residential Extensions* (2008) deals with loft conversions and roof alterations. The officer's report accepts that a flat roof dormer will usually be acceptable and it highlights that the HDAS states, as a guide, that on detached dwellings a dormer should be set down from the ridge of the original roof by at least 0.3m, set up from the eaves by 0.5m and set in from each side of the roof face by 1.0m. Each dormer would satisfy the guidelines apart from the distance they would be set up from the eaves which, according to the appellant, would measure 0.3m. Nevertheless, each dormer would be adequately framed by a reasonably large extent of tiled roof slope so that both would appear secondary to the size of the roof face within which they would be set. In these circumstances I do not consider the minor conflict with the HDAS to be critical.
5. Whilst the side roof slopes are partly visible within the street scene, due to the relationship of the appeal property with both neighbouring two-storey properties they are not overly exposed or prominent to a degree that would render any change unacceptable in principle. Neither do I find the architectural composition of the existing dwelling of such importance that it could not support an alteration to its roof that would include balanced dormer windows to either side.
6. Overall, I find that the proposed dormers would appear neither overly large nor bulky in relation to the existing roofscape of No 128. They would merely modify the appearance of the building to a form that would appear reasonably proportioned and balanced. As such, I find no conflict with the aims or objectives of the HDAS and neither do I find conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) or Policies BE13, BE15 or BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) insofar as they all relate to the quality of design and the need for new development to complement and harmonise with the existing local context.

Conditions

7. A condition specifying the relevant drawings is necessary as this provides certainty. In the interest of maintaining the character and appearance of the area it is necessary to ensure that the external materials used match the existing building.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the appeal property or the wider street scene. Accordingly, and in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, the appeal is allowed

John D Allan

INSPECTOR