
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2022

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3284237

17 Oakleigh Road, Uxbridge UB10 9EL

- 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 D Collison against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 2900/APP/2021/1574, dated 19 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and rear dormer window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I saw at the site visit that the appeal scheme has already been constructed on site and that consent has been sought retrospectively.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, including the appeal property.

Reasons

4. The acceptability of the proposed single storey rear extension is not at dispute between the parties and based on the evidence before me I have no substantive reason to conclude otherwise.
5. I saw at the site visit that the dormer extension, being of a considerable size and scale in itself and in proportion to the appeal property, dominates the rear roof and is a prominent and incongruous addition to the otherwise modest and well-proportioned property. In particular, the appeal plans show that the extension occupies almost the full width of the roof and projects above the original ridgeline of the property.
6. Furthermore, the fenestration of the dormer windows fails to respond to the existing rear elevation of the property, specifically the windows are not aligned with those below and the size and shape of the windows are not in keeping with the rest of the property.
7. At the site visit I saw, and the parties have referred to, a number of other dormer roof extensions in the area, the size and style of which varies. The presence of the extensions do not persuade me as to the acceptability of the appeal scheme before me.

8. It has been suggested by the appellant that a 'fallback' position exists were if "60mm lower in overall height it would be deemed Permitted Development". In this instance the 'fallback' position would represent an improvement to the scale and design of the dormer extension in comparison to the appeal scheme before me. Therefore, I have accorded this fall-back position limited weight.
9. For the reasons detailed above I find that the appeal scheme would harm the character and appearance of the area, including the appeal property. Thus the proposals are contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) that amongst other matters seeks development that is of a high design quality that responds to its context.

Conclusion

10. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mr M Brooker

INSPECTOR