The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2016

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 07 January 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/15/3137023
1 Castleton Road, Ruislip, Hillingdon HA4 9QQ

- 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 Michael Crawford against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 70715/APP/2015/2885, dated 31 July 2015, was refused by notice dated 12 October 2015.
- The development proposed is a loft conversion, side extension and internal alterations to the existing dwelling.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. Taking into account the Council's reason for refusal, the main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposed dormer window on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The proposal relates to this modestly sized bungalow which is sited at the junction of Castleton Road with Cranmer Close. The property is semi-detached, has a hipped roof and is set within a largely residential area.

4. The Council has published the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) which offers advice on various forms of development. In relation to loft conversions and roof extensions it advises that the rear roof slope of some properties may be visible from the public highway and the degree of visibility will influence the assessment of the visual impact of a proposal. The rear roof slope of the existing property is clearly visible from Cranmer Close and this would be more-so if the proposed single storey side extension were constructed as this would extend the rear roof slope.

5. The proposed dormer would span from the boundary of the building with its attached neighbour, across the existing rear roof and into the extension of the roof slope. Although it would be set down from the ridge of the roof and up from the eaves, I consider that its width would mean that it would dominate the rear roof slope and appear as a bulky addition to the roof which would make the building appear awkward and top-heavy. In its position where it would be clearly visible from the public highway, I consider that it would have

an unacceptably dominating effect on the existing property and on the street-scene.

6. The appellant states that dormer windows are a common feature and that the materials to be used would match the existing property. He adds that there are other dormers in the area that are larger than the one proposed herein. Whilst I agree that dormers are common and that the materials would match the locality, I do not find that these are matters which make the proposal acceptable. In relation to other dormers in the area, I did see some within the area but none as prominent as I judge the proposal would be and therefore I have employed an appropriate degree of sensitivity to the proposal, as set out in the HDAS.

7. I have taken account of all other matters raised but find nothing that is sufficient to outweigh my findings. The proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the host property and the surrounding area by reason of the size and prominence of the proposed dormer. As a consequence, the proposal raises conflict with Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR