



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2024

by **Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3334669

12 Blossom Way, Uxbridge, Hillingdon, UB10 9LL

- 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 Dr and Mrs Davinder Baghla against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 15924/APP/2023/1855, dated 25 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 25 September 2023.
- The development proposed is conversion of roof space to habitable use including rear dormer and 3 front roof lights.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for conversion of roof space to habitable use including rear dormer and 3 front roof lights at 12 Blossom Way, Uxbridge, Hillingdon, UB10 9LL in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 15924/APP/2023/1855, dated 25 June 2023 and the plans submitted with it, 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: 1385-3, 1385-4, 1385-5 Rev A and 1385-6 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Main issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 12 Blossom Way is a detached two storey house set back from the road in a good sized plot. It has had a number of extensions over time. It is in an established residential area and in an Area of Special Local Character. Other properties along the same side of the street are typically large, detached houses in a wide variety of designs in good sized plots along no regular building line. The properties on the other side of the road follow a more regular building line but are also typically large detached houses.

4. The policies relevant in this case include policies BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (November 2012) and DMHB5, DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management policies (January 2020) (the local plan) and D3 of the London Plan (2021). These relate to the design quality of new development, including extensions which, among other things, should be sympathetic to the host building and harmonise with the local environment. Roof extensions should be, among other things, located to the rear, subservient to the scale of the existing roof and no higher than the existing main ridge.
5. Areas of Special Local Character are a local designation by which the Council seeks to preserve and enhance the special character of the area and where it is important that extensions are appropriate to the building and cause no harm to the street scene in terms of matters including scale and height.
6. The proposal includes the raising of the roof over the existing side extension to the same height as the existing ridge line of the main part of the house. I consider that this would not appear overly large or bulky when viewed from the street either in the context of the existing house itself or the surroundings. It would be similar in size to the neighbouring property, No. 10, and although the crown roof would increase its apparent bulk, it would not result in the roof appearing top heavy and its impact on the street scene would be minimal due to its set back from the road. The architectural detail of the front projecting gable and entrance would remain to add interest to the front elevation.
7. The effect of the proposed alterations to the rear including the dormer windows would be to rationalise the existing haphazard and disjointed additions into a more unified appearance.
8. I consider that, although the increase in height of the roof over the existing side element would result in that part of the house no longer being subservient to the main part, the proposal as a whole would not result in an inappropriate or incongruous addition to the house or compromise its architectural integrity. It would not appear out of keeping with the scale, height, design or building lines in the street scene or the local area in general where the houses are typically large and irregularly sited within their plots and in relation to the road.
9. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the house or the surrounding area and that in this respect it is consistent with local plan policies BE1, DMHB5, DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1, and D3 of the London Plan.
10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

11. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council, having regard to the tests set out in the Framework. A condition detailing the plans is necessary to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and for the avoidance of doubt. A condition relating to the materials is necessary in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR