
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2021

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3272785

Copsewood House, 7 Pine Trees Drive, Ickenham, UB10 8AE

- 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 Pius Sedani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 51222/APP/2021/136, dated 12 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of two dormers at the front and the back of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of two dormers at the front and the back of the property at Copse Wood House, 7 Pine Trees Drive, Ickenham, UB10 8AE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 51222/APP/2021/136, dated 12 January 2021, 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 plans: Drg Nos PTD/EX/100, PTD/EX/101, PTD/EX/102, PTD/EX/103, PTD/EX/200, PTD/EX/400, PTD/PL/100, PTD/PL/101, PTD/PL/102, PTD/PL/103, and PTD/PL/200.
 - 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. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a large, modern, two-storey detached house with some limited accommodation at second floor level contained within the loft space.

The main part of the building has an 'H-shaped' floor and roof plan with its front and rear elevations symmetrical around a central vertical axis. The property sits at the reasonably narrow cul-de-sac entrance to Pine Trees Drive and faces towards the flank elevation and rear garden of No 4 The Drive. The proposal would add dormer windows to the front and rear elevations, each of similar scale and appearance, positioned centrally to each of the respective roof slopes, and recessed behind the hipped roof projections to each side.

4. The Council has no objection to the rear dormer window due, as stated within the officer's report, to its position. I have no reason to disagree. Whilst the rear dormer would be open to clear view from the open space to the rear of the appeal site along The Drive, it would sit comfortably within the property's rear roof slope, appearing as a well-proportioned and integrated part of the building's overall design, being lower than the height of the main ridge, well above the eaves, and away from the roof's hips and valleys. In this regard it would satisfy the guidelines for roof extensions and dormer windows contained within paragraph A1.20 to Appendix A of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (HLP Part 2).
5. The dormer window to the front would be equally well proportioned and assimilated into the roofscape. It too would appear as an integrated part of the building's design. Whilst the window sizes would not directly relate to the size of the windows below, they would be of similar appearance and proportions. Importantly, the building would retain its symmetrical form. My assessment of the front dormer is the same as for the rear dormer and I find nothing about the proposal that would appear incongruous or unsympathetic.
6. The Council states that front dormers are not part of the character of the road or the surrounding area. I disagree. During my visit I saw many properties along The Drive with front dormers of various types and sizes. Front dormer windows are common features in the locality. Pine Trees Drive differs in that the houses towards its terminal end display a similar design to each other, in contrast to the more eclectic mix along The Drive. Front dormers do not feature on any of these properties but this more regimented development pattern is not evident at the entrance to the cul-de-sac where Copse Wood House stands out as an individually designed property, more in-keeping with those along The Drive compared with those set deeper into Pine Trees Drive. The inclusion of a well-proportioned front dormer window would simply reinforce the existing individual style of No 7 within Pine Trees Close whilst also reflecting the variety of architecture within the wider locality.
7. Overall, I am satisfied that the front dormer window would relate well to the existing dwelling and would sit comfortably in the street scene without impacting in any harmful way upon the character or appearance of the area. As such, the proposal would display the quality of design that is required by both Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 and HLP Part 2 Policy DMHB 11. LP Part 2 Policy DMHD 1 deals specifically with alterations and extensions to residential dwellings. For the reasons given, there would be no conflict with the criteria listed within part A of Policy DMHD 1. Part E deals with roof extensions. Although there would be some limited conflict with this part of the policy where it states that roof extensions should be located on the rear elevation only, for the reasons I have amplified, material considerations lead me to conclude that the appeal should succeed. Although also referenced within the decision notice

there would be no conflict with HLP Part 2 Policy DMHB 12 which is specifically concerned with matters related to works to the public realm.

Conditions

8. A condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area, and to comply with Policy DMHD 1 part A iv), a condition is required to ensure that the extension is finished with materials that would match the existing house.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, I conclude that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of the area. Accordingly, and in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR