



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2023

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3315447

5 Chapter Close, Uxbridge UB10 9LA

- 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 Mrs Sachita Narain against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 41060/APP/2022/3074, dated 7 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is a part first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The properties within the small cul de sac vary in style and form and have an irregular and staggered alignment. No.5 Chapter Close is a detached property with a catslide roof to the front and has had the addition of a box roof dormer and single-storey flat roof extension across the full width to the rear. The neighbouring property, No.7, is set significantly further back with the entirety of the side elevation to the appeal property visible from the road.
4. The extension would sit above part of the single-storey extension. It would not extend the full depth, but the pitched roof would project over part of the existing dormer with the ridge positioned just below the bottom of the windows. This would create a cluttered and inharmonious arrangement which together with the existing alterations would not reflect the appearance of the original property and consume the rear elevation.
5. Whilst the development is to the rear, the bulk of the projection and the relationship with the dormer window would be seen in views of the side elevation from Chapter Close. The rear elevation is also visible from Hercies Road where the first-floor extension would be an intrusive and incongruous feature, further drawing attention to the property and the rear composition which would be out of keeping with the prevailing pattern of development.
6. I thereby find that the development would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the surrounding area contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies

(November 2012), Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D4 and D8 of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework, which together promote good design that harmonises with the local context, and appropriately integrates with the public realm.

Other Matters

7. Interested parties have raised matters relating to other alterations to the property, in particular the dormer window, which was erected under permitted development rights, and a side window. While I understand the frustration with the various planning applications and works to the property my considerations are restricted to the proposed development before me. The Council has not raised any concerns in relation to the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties and I have no reason to disagree with that assessment. Notwithstanding this, I have found against the proposal on the main issue.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR