



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/23/3325300

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/2023/845, dated 16 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2023.
- The development proposed is a two storey rear extension with accommodation in roof.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

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

¹ Reference: 1055/APP/2022/3345.

² Reference: 1055/APP/2023/1859.

³ Reference: APP/R5510/D/23/3332731.

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 the area with an attractive sense of uniformity.
8. I also noted during my site visit that whilst within this general sense of uniformity, many dwellings in the area have been altered and/or extended and the appearance of individual dwellings varies, 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 large gable roof has resulted in the house appearing prominently in an area where neighbouring roofs along this part of Queens Walk tend to be modest in size and hipped.
10. The appeal property 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.
11. The proposed development would extend the already extended dwelling to the rear, at ground floor and first floor level and would add a large crown roof to the rear of the recently converted gable roof.
12. The overall effect of the proposal would be to add such significant scale and volume as to overwhelm what is already a prominent dwelling of dominant appearance.
13. It would I find, result in a combined roof and rear extension that would fail to appear subordinate to the host property and which would draw attention to itself as an overly large and bulky addition. Further, the proposed crown roof would visually jar with the host property, appearing as an unsympathetic addition.
14. In addition, the harm arising from the above would be exacerbated as a result of the proposal appearing incongruous in its surroundings, where no such roof form as that proposed exists.
15. Taking all of the above into account, 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) Policy D3; to Local Plan⁴ Policy BE1; and to Development Management⁵ Policies DMHB11 and DMHD1, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

16. The appellant, in support of the proposal, draws attention to a crown roof at Number 67 Queens Walk. I viewed this property during my site visit and noted that its roof form bears little resemblance to the proposal the subject of the appeal before me and consequently, it does not provide for direct comparison. Notwithstanding this and in any case, I have found that the proposed

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

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

development would harm local character and the impacts of this harm are not reduced by the presence of other developments elsewhere.

Conclusion

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

N McGurk

INSPECTOR