



Appeal Statement

Consilio

Against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon to refuse planning permission for:

‘Part two storey, part single storey rear extension and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include
2 side dormers’

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	2
2. THE APPEAL SITE AND SURROUNDINGS	2
3. THE APPEAL PROPOSAL	3
4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY	3
5. GROUNDS OF APPEAL	3
6. POLICY CONTEXT	3
7. THE CASE FOR THE APPELLANT	4
8. CONDITIONS	6
9. CONCLUSION	6

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: APPROVED PLANS AND INSPECTORS DECISION (APP/R5510/D/16/3151560)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 On the 16th October 2018, a planning application was submitted to the London Borough of Hillingdon for the erection of a 'part two store, part single storey rear extension and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include 2 side dormers.'

The Council refused the decision on the following grounds:

- 1) *The roof alterations/extensions, by reason of the size, scale, bulk and design of the dormer windows would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan; Part One – Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies Be13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan; Part Two- Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS; Residential Extensions.*
- 1.2 The application which is the subject of this appeal follows the submission of application 15585/APP/2016/1074. Application 15585/APP/2016/1074 was allowed at appeal on the 12th July 2016 (**A copy of the Inspector's report and approved plans form part of Appendix A**).
- 1.3 The appeal proposal seeks to amend the original scheme through the introduction of two side facing dormers. The part single storey, part two storey aspect of the rear extension remain exactly as allowed at appeal under ref APP/R5510/D/16/3151560. The Council have accepted this and raise no objections to the rear extension, notably their reasons for refusal stem around the dormer windows.

2.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE APPEAL SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The appeal site comprises of a detached dwelling located on the northern side of Hoylake Crescent. The site itself is quite narrow in nature and due to the density of the dwellings, the spacing between the flank walls of the properties are good but with views to the rear of the sites rather restricted.
- 2.2 The appeal dwelling itself is somewhat unique in nature. It is one of the few examples in the vicinity where the whole dwelling is finished in render with the general use of materials in the area being a dark red stock brick. Additionally, the dwelling has a unique roof profile that incorporates a Dutch hipped roof which runs front-to-back where as traditionally this profile would be more akin to a chalet bungalow running left-to-right. In this regard, it is considered that the existing dwelling has somewhat strong and unique architectural features.
- 2.3 The dwellings unique appearance within the street scene is somewhat strengthened by the existing front and side facing dormer windows that remain in situ. These established forms of roof alterations carry on the theme of forward facing dormer windows that existing along this side of Hoylake Crescent.
- 2.4 Examples of side facing dormers exist within the street scene of Hoylake Crescent. The notable examples being No.150 and No. 178 Hoylake Crescent which retain a rather 'boxy' construction of dormer that is representative of the time they were built.

However, section 3 of the grounds of appeal addresses how the design, scale and appearance of the proposed dormers would be a welcome introduction to the street scene when compared to these other established forms of development.

- 2.5 Having carried out a character assessment of Hoylake Crescent and adjoining areas, the properties within the area can only be characterised as being detached in nature with hipped roofs. The proximity of the dwellings to the road allows for adequate off-street parking with a large number of dwellings not retaining much soft landscaping to facilitate additional off-street parking provisions. The high density of dwellings within this part of the district ensures dwellings are situated closer together than traditional detached dwellings. As a result of this, views to the rear of the site are somewhat limited.
- 2.6 The application site falls within the developed area of the Hillingdon Local Plan. There are no other relevant planning designations covering this property that the applicant is aware of or the council have highlighted.

3.0 THE APPEAL PROPOSAL

- 3.1 This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a 'part two storey, part single storey rear extension and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include 2 side dormers.'
- 3.2 The proposed extensions and alterations to the dwelling are summarised as follows:
- Part two storey, part single storey- as allowed under appeal ref: (APP/R5510/D/16/3151560)
 - Side facing dormer windows.

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 15585/APP/2016/1074 – Part two storey, part single storey rear extension (**Allowed at appeal- APP/R5510/D/16/3151560**). (**Appendix A**)

5.0 GROUNDS OF APPEAL

- 5.1 The Appellant's grounds of appeal are that:
- The proposed dormer windows would result in a harmonious form of development that would not adversely harm the character and appearance of the dwelling.
 - Dormer windows form an established form of development to the existing roof profile and the proposed dormers would significantly improve the appearance of these.

6.0 THE POLICY CONTEXT

- 6.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that all planning decisions are required to be made in accordance with the development plan

for the area unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The appeal must, therefore, be considered within the context of the Statutory Development Plan for the London Borough of Hillingdon, which comprises:

- Hillingdon Local Plan- Strategic Policies (November 2012)
- Hillingdon Local Plan - Saved UDP Policies (2012)
- The London Plan (2016)
- The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012)
- Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts

The above documents are, therefore, material considerations in the determination of this appeal.

The policies cited in the Council's decision notice, the Officers report and other relevant policies are as follows:

Hillingdon Local Plan (2012)

BE1- Built Environment and Heritage

BE13 - New development must harmonise with the existing street scene

BE15 - Proposals for alterations and extensions must harmonise with the scale, form and architectural composition of the original building

BE19- New development must improve or compliment the character of the area

London Plan (2016)

Paragraph 3.4 - Optimising Housing Potential

7.0 APPELLANT'S CASE

- 7.1 The Council's reason for refusal focuses on the perceived impact the dormer windows would have on the architectural composition of the dwelling and the appearance of the wider area.
- 7.2 Policy BE1 requires new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment in order to create successful and sustainable neighbourhoods. Particular emphasis is placed on extensions and alterations enhancing the local distinctiveness of the area.
- 7.3 Particular emphasis is placed upon the prominence of the dormer windows within the street scene by the planning officer. However, the appellant considers adequate weighting has not been given to the existing roof alterations in situ. By virtue of the fact that dormer windows form part of the principle and flank roof profiles, their presence cannot be ignored or simply put to one side as the planning officer has sought to.

- 7.3 An existing dormer window on the north-western roof slope has been established for some time. It forms a type of development that has now become harmonised with the existing roof profile. The dormer window that is proposed to replace it is materially larger.
- 7.4 The case officer's continuous referral to the HDAS is misleading and largely based on a technical analysis, as opposed to site specifics. The ridge height of the proposed dormer window matches that of the existing dormer meaning sufficient distances have been maintained between the flat roof of the dormer and the ridge height of the primary dwelling. This degree of separation ensures that the dormer window when viewed overall does not visually coalesce with the highest point of the main roof.
- 7.5 Additionally, the width of the dormer when compared to the original house is only 200mm wider. At no stage could the Council reasonably consider that an increase in 200mm would adversely impact the appearance of the western roof slope when compared to the existing arrangement.
- 7.6 The proposed dormer windows increase in size draws it closer to the eaves. This gives the appearance of a bulkier addition when in fact it is only the dormers vertical emphasis that has changed. Whilst it is accepted that the set down from the eaves does not meet the HDAS guidance of 0.5m, a proposed 300mm set-up is proposed that allows for a clear visible distinction between the eaves and the edge of the dormer by allowing for a clear tiled surface. This works towards ensuring the proposed dormer does not appear to engulf the roof slope and at no point can it be considered that the dormer windows dominates or over-powers the western roof profile.
- 7.7 It is considered that the existing dormer is more offensive by virtue of its tile faced front. The introduction of fenestration would be more akin to other forms of similar development in the area. The introduction of windows on this roof slope would work towards ensuring the dormer does not appear as 'boxy' as the current arrangement appears.
- 7.8 The eastern facing roof slope is untouched and the proposal introduces a new dormer in this location. The case officer considers because the roof slopes are visible, it would render the dormers visually prominent. The appellant strongly contests this as dwellings along Hoylake Crescent as closely positioned alongside one another. Whilst the spacing between dwellings is consistent, the densely packed nature of the properties does not widely expose the flank elevations to the street scene. The positioning of the host building within its plot as well as its relationship with the neighbouring properties would render elements of the dormers visible from the public realm.
- 7.9 Notwithstanding the above, the appellant considers the siting of the dormers within the roof slope ensures they would not be as prominent as the Council consider. The proposed dormer windows are set back approx. 1.6m from the principal elevation of the dwelling. This set back would work towards ensuring the side walls of the dormers do not sit adjacent the front of the dwelling which would minimise their visual impact.

- 7.10 The appellant wishes to raise one final point before offering closing comments with regards to the grounds of appeal. The case officer in their report refers to the side dormer windows being proposed solely for ‘a little more floor space in the attic rooms.’ The appellant considers this comment to be in poor taste. The appellant wishes to offer the following comments: ‘An individual does not navigate the planning process other than where it becomes a necessity for extra space. The pyramid of professional fees and Council fees are not those anyone would incur without genuine need. We require the additional bedroom for our family which has recently grown. In a tough and unpredictable market where uncertainty remains the word of the day in the build up to Brexit, extending ones property is more effective then relocating.’

8.0 OTHER MATTERS

- 8.1 As a matter of housekeeping and for the avoidance of any doubt, the appellant wishes to address a small matter with regards to the description used by the LPA. The Council’s description refers to the ‘conversion of roofspace to habitable use’. As the existing plans demonstrate, the existing roof is currently and has been historically used as habitable accommodation. The notable alteration to the roof profile is simply the introduction of the 2 side dormers.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 In summary, the appellant considers the alterations to the dwelling to represent sympathetic and appropriate change to the host building that would not appear bulky, prominent or visually obtrusive within the street scene and immediate vicinity. The proposed roof alterations would harmonise with the existing dwelling and other established forms of development within the street scene where there are a number of similar forms of development incorporating side dormers. The proposed dormers would be a significant improvement to those already established within the vicinity.
- 9.2 The Council and the appellants have accepted much common ground from accepting the two storey rear extension does not conflict with the development plan (subject to the previous appeal decision). Parking provision is considered to be acceptable for the number of units and as such, it is kindly requested that the appeal is allowed and planning permission granted.