



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2024

**by K E Down MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 9<sup>th</sup> August 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3344257**

**32 Bury Avenue, Ruislip, Hillingdon, HA4 7RT**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Mark Edwards against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref is 23834/APP/2024/357.
  - The development proposed is the extension of existing habitable roof space including 1 no. rear dormer.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed rear dormer on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a detached chalet bungalow situated on the corner of Bury Avenue and Howletts Lane, both quiet, established residential streets characterised by mainly detached houses and bungalows. A significant number of dwellings have been extended and altered, including through the addition or enlargement of habitable accommodation in the roof space. There is thus a wide diversity of design in the area.
4. The appeal dwelling lies between two other chalet bungalows and originally the three would have had a similar appearance. However, the appeal bungalow has been significantly altered and enlarged through a hip to half hip roof conversion, the removal of small dormers, the addition of two front dormers and a large rear dormer, changes to the original fenestration, rendering and the use of replacement grey roof tiles. It therefore stands out as being different from its neighbours with little remaining visual consistency.
5. The half hip roof alterations and front dormers were permitted by the Council in 2023 and have been completed. However, during the construction, the two permitted rear dormers were replaced by a single large dormer. It is this to which the Council objects and I shall therefore restrict my further consideration to the single rear dormer.

6. The rear dormer is large but is well set in from the side eaves and down from the ridge so that a sufficient element of the roof profile is retained above and to the sides. However, it extends beyond the sloped plane of the roof, over a flat roofed rear projection, ending just short of the eaves. It is therefore unduly deep and bulky. It dominates the rear elevation of the dwelling, giving it an unbalanced appearance and, owing to the corner position of the bungalow, is clearly visible from Howletts Lane from where it appears as an excessively large and incongruous addition. Overall, the rear dormer owing to its size materially detracts from the character and appearance of the original chalet bungalow.
7. The appellant draws my attention to other large dormers in the wider area and to two appeal decisions for development, including roof dormers, in Bury Avenue and Howletts Lane. However, from the evidence before me and in both appeal cases it appears that the rear dormers are generally subservient and proportionate, retaining sufficient elements of the original roof above, below and to the sides of the dormer. I therefore find that these examples are not readily comparable with the appeal proposal.
8. I noticed that in a small number of cases very large dormers have been constructed in the surrounding area that are clearly visible in the street scene. However, they are not so numerous as to be characteristic of the area and these examples of poor design would not justify allowing additional unsympathetic development.
9. It is concluded on the main issue that the proposed rear dormer would, owing to its size and in particular its depth, and to its prominence in the street scene have a materially detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. In consequence, it would conflict with Policy D4 of the London Plan, 2021, and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Council's Local Plan: Part 2 – Development Management Policies, 2020. Taken together and amongst other things, these expect new development to achieve a high quality of design that is appropriate in terms of layout and scale so that it harmonises with the local context such that there is no adverse cumulative impact on the character or appearance of the wider area. In particular, roof extensions should be subservient to the scale of the existing roof and should retain a substantial element of the original roof slope above the eaves line.
10. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*KE Down*  
INSPECTOR