



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2025

**by D Cramond BSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 06 May 2025**

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/25/3362076**

**40 Lawrence Drive, Ickenham UB10 8RW**

- 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 Steven Dungey against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref is 15078/APP/2024/2155.
- The development proposed is alteration to roof profile including the erection of a side extension to roof and insertion of solar panels on the front slope.

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached home on the outside of a bend in a medium density generally traditional suburban road. Like its neighbour, it is of hipped roof design with a similar two storey flat roofed element to the side. The area is of established residential character and the streetscene is relatively settled and pleasing in appearance. The proposal is as described above with the plans introducing a hip-to-gable conversion and a pitched roof gable-ended side extension to the roof, along with the installation of solar panels on much of the front slope.
4. Contrary to the Appellant's assertion I found that the outer edge of corner position of the dwelling made the site more prominent than homes in most stretches of the road. It is always important to seek to display good design but this makes that aim even more valid.
5. Regrettably, my assessment is that the appeal scheme would look very ill-at-ease on this individual property, on this pairing, and in this streetscene generally. The development would be too strident, the works would be excessive in scale and lack suitable subservience, and gable ends would dominate in a position where this would be inappropriate. The very slightly lower ridge of the new side roof does not display subservience in my opinion. Overall, I am concerned that the size and design of the roof extensions,

compounded by the planned roof panels, would be overly impactful and excessive, harmful to the qualities of the existing dwelling, its semi-detached symmetry, and the character and appearance of the street. Any roof proposals would need to be of a markedly more subtle nature and the panels reduced to achieve aesthetically suitable development in my opinion. Total symmetry is not always called for but this scheme would go too far out of line.

6. Policies DMHB11 and DMHD1 of the Hillington Local Plan: Part Two Development Management Policies (2020) and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) are relevant. They share common themes of seeking to protect or enhance the character and appearance of buildings and their neighbourhood, to ensure harmonious development and the safeguarding of local distinctiveness. Given the above I conclude that the appeal scheme would run contrary to these policies.

*Other matters*

7. I do understand the wish to undertake modernisation and the matter of encouragement for, and necessary orientation of, solar panels. I note the 'permitted development' fall-back case put for the latter but, in this instance, they are proposed as part of a new roof form. I considered the roof alterations drawn to my attention and found variation in size, form and positioning. I do not know the planning background of the examples but certainly a number would not be a suitable benchmark of good design. In any event I must determine the submitted scheme on its own merits. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
8. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered; the Councils' policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within the Framework.

*Overall conclusion*

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

*D Cramond*

INSPECTOR