

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2017

by J Dowling BA(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/17/3177756
364A West End Road, Ruislip HA4 6RB

- 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 Grzegorz Mokrzancki against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 72262/APP/2017/682, dated 2 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 20 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion, new dormer facing back and one roof window facing front (resubmission).
-

Decision

1. This appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises part of a semi-detached pair of two storey maisonettes located on the junction of West End Road and Wingfield Way. The area is predominantly residential with a variety of house styles. I note from my site visit that whilst a number of properties have been extended and altered there were no visible alterations at roof level.
 4. The Hillingdon Design and Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions (2008) (the SPD) provides specific advice with regards to roof extensions and alterations. It advocates that the more visible a roof is from public areas the more important for any roof alteration to be well designed. It requires that dormer windows should be constructed in the centre of the roof face; set below the ridge by 0.3m; 0.5m back from the eaves and 0.5m from the sides of the roof. Design and size of windows should match existing.
 5. The proposed rear dormer would comply with the majority of these requirements. Furthermore, I agree with the appellant that the proposal would not adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. However, whilst I accept that the bulk and mass of the proposed dormer would be relatively limited and it would be in materials that match the host building it would not be set down from the ridge. Given the corner location of the property although it would benefit from some screening from the roof of the rear addition it would still be visually prominent when viewed
-

from the adjoining streets. As a result in my judgement without an appropriate set down from the ridge the proposal would not appear as a subordinate feature within the roofspace.

6. As a result I consider that the proposal would, due to its lack of set down from the ridge, be visually dominant and out of character with the host property and the surrounding area contrary to policies BE1 of A Vision for 2026 Local Plan: Part One –Strategic Policies (2012) and BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (adopted 1998) Saved Policies (2007) and the guidance contained within the SPD which together aim to ensure that new development proposals are of a high quality design which harmonise with the character and appearance of existing buildings and the streetscene. These policies are consistent with the Framework which seeks, amongst other things to secure good quality design.
7. The appellant has advocated that if the property was a house then much more extensive extensions and alterations would be allowed under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order (England) 2015. However, the appeal site is a flat and as a result I consider that the extensions allowed under permitted development do not represent a viable fallback position to which I can attach any weight.
8. I note the appellants concern that they consider permitted development rights are inequitable as they are only available to people who own houses. However, flats are excluded from most permitted development rights on the basis that they only form part of the building that would be affected as a result of the extensions and/or alterations.
9. Policy BE1 requires new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment and as a consequence I consider that it is relevant to consider it when determining this appeal.
10. I note that the current unit may not comply with the space standards set out in the national technical housing standards. However, these standards are applied to new units and are therefore in my opinion are not applicable.

Conclusion

11. For the above reason, and having regard to all matters raised, this appeal should be dismissed.

Jo Dowling

INSPECTOR