



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2025

by **John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/25/3369436

10 Hartshill Close, Uxbridge, Hillingdon, UB10 9LH

- 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 Charan Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 30535/APP/2025/1002.
 - The development proposed is amendment to roof with the replacement of hip ends with gable ends and installation of 2 Nos of roof light to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for amendment to roof with the replacement of hip ends with gable ends and installation of 2 Nos of roof light to front elevation at 10 Hartshill Close, Uxbridge, Hillingdon, UB10 9LH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 30535/APP/2025/1002, and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matter

2. The application was made retrospectively, and at the time of my visit the development was complete.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a detached, gable fronted dwelling set within a residential cul-de-sac. It sits at one end of a row of close-set, similar type properties (Nos 10-24 even), but each display considerable variation to their frontages in terms of tile cladding, fenestration details, and front porches. No 10 is further differentiated by its raised ridge and eaves heights in comparison to the others, following prior approval granted on appeal in December 2023 (Ref APP/R5510/W/23/3321565), for development described as '*The addition of an additional second floor to provide one extra bedroom and a bathroom. The additional floor has been designed to provide accommodation set within the roof space. The pitch of the roof facing the highway has been maintained at his original pitch but raised up*'. There is further variation within Hartshill Close, with repeat alternative house types opposite with individual alterations amongst them.

5. In keeping with others along the row, No 10 has a single-storey ground floor projection to the front with a pitched roof over. In the case of No 10, it spans the full width of the property, as is so for most in the group, but not all others, adding further to the variation. In all cases, the roof over the front canopy is tiled with hip ends. The works undertaken at No 10 differ by having converted the hip ends to gables, and with two roof lights inserted into the front roof slope.
6. The altered canopy roof to No 10 marks it out as different to others within the row, but not significantly so. The canopy retains the roof's original pitch and has been neither extended forward nor raised in height. It maintains a continuous alignment, set back with others to this side of Hartshill Close, and uses materials that closely match those on the exterior of the dwelling. Rather than appearing to jar, as suggested by the Council, the changes appeared to me as relatively minor and low-key modifications that were well assimilated into the street scene, reflective of other sympathetic changes to some over time, and merely indicative of how the cul-de-sac as a whole has evolved.
7. Overall, I am satisfied that, as a result of the development, there has been no harm to the character or appearance of the street scene. As such, there is no conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHD1, DMHB11 and DMHB12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020), or with Policies D4 and D8 of The London Plan 2021. Between them, and amongst other things, these seek to ensure new development is of a high standard that respects the design of the original property and harmonises with local context.

Conditions

8. As the development has taken place, and based upon my findings, I have no reason to impose any conditions.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR