



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 August 2021

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3278945

24 Grasmere Avenue, Ruislip, Middx HA4 7PJ

- 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 & Mrs M Thorpe against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref: 75778/APP/2021/885 dated 5 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2021.
- The development proposed is single storey side/rear extension raising the ridge height to provide habitable use with side/dormers and internal alterations following refusal 75778/APP/2020/3677.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the application was determined and the appeal submitted, the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) has been revised in July 2021. However, I do not consider that the changes directly affect the appeal proposal before me, but all references in the decision letter are to the July 2021 version.

Main Issue

3. The Council has confirmed that it has no objection to the proposed raising of the roof height and proposed ground floor additions and from my site visit and all the information before me, I have no reason to take a different view. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposals, and particularly the side dormers, on the character and appearance of the property and the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached bungalow of modest scale on the northern side of Grasmere Avenue, within a predominantly residential area, with both bungalows and two storey properties. The existing property has been extended to the rear.
5. The proposal would create a larger rear extension and raise the roof ridge over the main part of the house with a lower extension to the rear to create accommodation at first floor level. There would be a flat roofed side dormer to each side, together with a new window at the rear and rooflights to the side and front.

6. The proposed dormers would be set back from the front elevation and would be centrally sited within the side pitch of the main roof. However, there would be very limited inset from either the new ridge line or the eaves line. With their flat roofs the proposed side dormers would create a very bulky and box-like appearance at roof level. The extended roof with these proposed side dormers would be top heavy in relation to the modest proportions of the dwelling.
7. As a result, the property as proposed to be extended would also appear visually intrusive and over dominant in the street scene. This would harm the character and appearance of the local area.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development, and in particular the side dormers would harm the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area. This would conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DHMB11, DHMB12 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020) as well as the Framework and in particular Section 12, all of which seek a high standard of design which respects the local context.
9. The Appellant has drawn my attention to a number of other permitted and built roof dormers in the local area, which I also saw on my site visit. Whilst I agree that side dormers are not uncommon in the local area, each proposal must be judged on its individual merits. I am not persuaded that the other examples which have been brought to my attention are all directly comparable with the proposal before me and they do not therefore persuade me to a different conclusion.
10. The property as extended would provide additional accommodation to meet the needs of the family, but these personal reasons do not outweigh the harm I have concluded.
11. The Appellant has drawn my attention to the planning reforms introduced in 2020 with changes to the General Permitted Development Order, of which I am well aware. These new classes of 'permitted development' are subject to limitations and the requirement for prior approval. Such an application is not before me and I have assessed the proposal on the basis upon which it has been submitted, as I am required to do.
12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR