

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2024

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3332731
49 Queens Walk, Ruislip, Hillingdon, HA4 0LX

- 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 K Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 1055/APP/2023/1859, dated 26 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 18 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is a ground floor rear and part first floor rear extension. 2 x rear dormers. Balcony with screens to roof of ground floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. An application¹ was approved in December 2022 for the conversion of roof space to habitable use to include front and rear roof lights and conversion of roof from hip to gable end. The development approved has since taken place.
3. A recent planning application² at the appeal property for a different form of development to that the subject of this appeal was refused and is the subject of a separate appeal³.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two storey detached brick and tile dwelling located in a prominent position, directly opposite Queens Walk's junction with Down Barns Road.
6. The appeal property is located in a residential area characterised by the presence of detached and semi-detached brick-built two storey dwellings.

¹ Reference: 1055/APP/2022/3345.

² Reference: 1055/APP/2023/845.

³ Reference: APP/R5510/D/23/3325300.

Houses are set back from the street behind short front gardens and/or driveways and have long gardens to the rear.

7. During my site visit, I observed that the set-back of dwellings, similar building heights and the use of similar materials, notably brick and tile, combines with the regular presence of design features including occasional white render, black Tudor-style boards and front gables and bays, to provide for an attractive sense of uniformity.
8. I also noted during my site visit that within this general sense of uniformity, the appearance of individual dwellings varies. Many dwellings in the area have been altered and/or extended and such changes generally appear in keeping with the host property and local character.
9. The appeal property is a large detached dwelling and the recent conversion of its roof from a hipped roof to a gable roof has resulted in the house appearing prominently in an area where neighbouring roofs along this part of Queens Walk tend to be hipped and modest in scale. The dwelling also appears prominently from the rear, where the large roof and a large two storey flat-roofed extension are visible from gardens, allotments and the surrounding area.
10. The proposed development would add another bulky, flat-roofed two storey extension to the rear. This would be similar to that which already exists. The proposal would also add a large flat-roofed single storey rear extension which would stretch across the width of the dwelling.
11. I find that, together, the overall scale and volume of these two elements would result in the appeal property appearing unduly large, bulky and dominant in its surroundings.
12. The harm arising from this would be exacerbated as a result of the proposed flat roofs to the single and two storey rear extensions. These would fail to harmonise with the overall appearance of the host property and would appear incongruous within an area where no other properties have such additions.
13. Further, this sense of incongruity would be increased as a result of the proposed balcony, which would appear conspicuous, drawing the eye and emphasising the visual dominance of the proposal.
14. In addition to all of the above, I find that the proposed dormers would add further bulk to what is already a large and dominant roof form. They would combine with the proposed rear extensions and balcony to result in a form of development that would overwhelm the appearance of and fail to appear subordinate to, the host dwelling.
15. Consequently, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to London Plan (2021) Policies D3 and D4; to Local Plan⁴ Policy BE1; and to Development Management⁵ Policies DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

⁴ Reference: Hillingdon Local Plan Part One – Strategic Policies (2012).

⁵ Reference: Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020).

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR