



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 June 2026

by **D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 July 2026

Appeal Ref: 6010331

28 Dawley Avenue, Uxbridge UB8 3BU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Dawrah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 14440/APP/2026/116.
 - The development proposed is described as the extension of the existing outbuildings gable end pitched roof to extend across and replace the area currently enclosed with a partial flat roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the extension of the existing outbuildings gable end pitched roof to extend across and replace the area currently enclosed with a partial flat roof at 28 Dawley Avenue, Uxbridge UB8 3BU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 14440/APP/2026/116, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: S01; S02; S03; S04; C10 and C11.
 - 3) The external materials of the roof extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing outbuilding's pitched roof.

Procedural Matter

2. The revised National Planning Policy Framework was published in December 2025 but does not raise any new matters which affect the assessment of this appeal scheme.

Main Issue

3. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, in particular the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached outbuilding located within the rear garden of a dwelling situated at the junction of Dawley Avenue and Chester Close. In part, the property possesses a very shallow mono-pitched roof, akin to a flat roof in appearance, which is adjacent to the boundary with Chester Close. The remainder

of the property possesses a pitched gable roof form. The proposed development would replace the flat roof with a similarly designed gable roof. Policy DMHD2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (DMP) provides criteria for the erection of new outbuildings rather than alterations to existing buildings. However, this policy does require outbuildings to be constructed to a high standard of design.

5. The dwellings fronting Chester Close are sited away from the footways to the rear of front gardens. Although there is a single storey side addition, the original 2-storey flank wall of 28 Dawley Avenue is also set back from the footway along Chester Close reflecting the return building line. The flat roof part of the outbuilding is sited forward of these neighbouring dwellings with a garage style door fronting the footway. There is a circa 1.8-metre high brick wall adjacent to the footway which is the side boundary for the garden of No. 28.
6. The area surrounding the property is predominantly residential with dwellings of a mix of designs, including some which have been altered. As with No. 28, at road junctions the 2-storey flank walls of dwellings are set back from the side boundaries reflecting the existing return building lines. However, there are examples of single storey side additions to dwellings sited forward of the return building lines. Elsewhere within the surrounding area, there are also examples at road junctions whereby outbuildings are sited forward of return building lines. These single storey outbuildings and side additions do not materially detract from the sense of openness at the junctions.
7. There was a previous appeal at the property for the erection of a single-storey rear extension, two-storey side and single-storey front extension/front porch (Ref APP/R5510/D/24/3347531). This previous appeal was dismissed because, in part, the Inspector opined that the resulting property would have brought a 2-storey built form much closer to Chester Close and it would have been beyond the return building line of the dwellings on this road. The Inspector was concerned about the proposal representing a visually prominent addition to the property and the loss of openness at the road junction.
8. This appeal scheme is materially different to the previous appeal scheme because it concerns an existing single storey outbuilding which is not sited at the junction itself but is within the rear garden of No. 28. Further, the proposed roof extension would not result in the outbuilding appearing to be a 2-storey built form.
9. By reason of its increased height and massing, the appeal scheme would increase the visual prominence of the outbuilding within the streetscene along Chester Close. However, the altered single storey outbuilding would be sited away from the junction where the 2-storey dwellings either side of Chester Close would remain more visually prominent in the streetscene. Further, because the outbuilding exists the appeal scheme would not introduce a new form of built development forward of the return building line along Chester Close. The resulting outbuilding would not be such a visually prominent addition to the streetscene that it would cause an unacceptable loss to the open character and appearance of the road junction.
10. The introduction of a cohesive design of the outbuilding's roof would improve its appearance within the streetscene along Chester Close. The proposed pitched roof extending across the full length of the outbuilding would also reflect the pitched

roof forms of the dwellings within the surrounding area. The first floor and roof of 1 Chester Close would still be visible above the proposed pitched roof.

11. By reason of there being no increase in the footprint of the outbuilding, the appeal scheme would not result in the built forms of development within the curtilage of No. 28 appearing to be an overdevelopment of this plot. Further, the proposed pitched roof would not result in a cramped form of development within the curtilage of No. 28.
12. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, in particular the streetscene, and, as such it would not conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies and DMP Policies DMHB11 and DMHD2. Amongst other matters and in addition to the design of outbuildings, these policies require all development to be designed to the highest standards and to incorporate principles of good design, including harmonising with the local context by taking into account the surrounding building lines and setbacks, gaps between structures and other streetscape elements.
13. Policy D8 of the London Plan and DMP Policy DMHB12 concern the public realm rather than the type of development proposed. LP Policy D4 concerns larger scale proposals rather than being of specific relevance to this householder scheme.

Conditions

14. For reasons of clarity, a condition is necessary to identify the approved drawings. To ensure the proposed development is assimilated into the streetscene a condition to secure the use of external materials which match the outbuilding's existing pitched roof is necessary. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be allowed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR