



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17th June 2024

by Megan Thomas K.C. Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3337868

48 Pole Hill Road, Uxbridge UB10 0QB

- 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 Syed Hussain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref. is 33924/APP/2023/2780.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part single, part double storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the first floor extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated on the corner of Pole Hill Road and Harrow View in a residential area in Uxbridge. It is a detached bungalow which has accommodation in the roof space and a wedge-shaped rear garden with an outbuilding towards the end of it. The bungalow has a gable end facing Pole Hill Road and in each roof slope there is a large single dormer each with two windows. The dormers have flat roofs which sit below the ridgeline of the main roof. There has been some ground floor extension at the rear.
4. 50 Pole Hill Road is a detached bungalow and is located to the north of the appeal site and 2 Harrow View is a two-storey detached dwelling located to the south. The rear boundary of the appeal site adjoins the side boundary of 1 Harrow View. The site is in an area covered by a Tree Preservation Order (no.798) but there would be no trees affected by the proposal.
5. The development proposed is a part single, part double storey extension to the rear. The ground floor single storey element has been approved under application reference 33924/APP/2023/1218 (permission dated 8/9/2023) and remains extant.

6. The proposed first floor rear extension would be at roof level as the property is a bungalow. It would measure about 3.45m in depth and about 5.90m in width and be about 5.30m from ground level. The drawings show the roof being flat and the first floor extension sitting on the ground floor extension which has a 3 sided pitched skirt roof wrapping around it.
7. Whilst the proposed first floor element of the rear extension would not exceed the height of the main roof ridgeline and the proposed dormer would be of a width that would allow part of each side dormer cheek to be seen, it would, nevertheless, exacerbate both the box-like appearance of the dwelling and its top-heavy appearance. It would also mask the rear gable which is a valuable remaining defining characteristic of the original bungalow. Overall, it would be a poor, overdeveloped and inharmonious design.
8. On my site visit, I noted that a prominent feature of some of the bungalows in the area was the gable-end facing the road and side dormers in each of the roof slopes. The dwellings on the west side of Pole Hill Road could generally be described as such. However, additional rear roof dormers on that form of the bungalow did not seem to be prevalent or to typify the area. The proposed first floor element at the appeal site would be in a prominent location visible from the streetscene of Harrow View. It would dominate the rear elevation notwithstanding the use of matching external materials. It would not be sympathetic to the host dwelling or sympathetic to the character or appearance of the surrounding area.
9. I have borne in mind that it would add valuable living space to the dwelling but this does not outweigh the harm I have identified.
10. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed first floor extension would result in significant harm to the host dwelling and surrounding area. It would be contrary to policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (adopted 2012) and policies DMHD 1, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies (adopted 2020).

Conclusion

11. Having considered all relevant representations, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.

INSPECTOR