



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 August 2023

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3321601

46 Willow Grove, Ruislip HA4 6DF

- 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 Dariusz Swigon against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref: 49093/APP/2023/314 dated 01 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 30 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is replacing existing back kitchen extension and conservatory for the single extension. Conversion of the loft space to habitable use including both sides conversion from hip to gable end and rising of the roof height. The new roof will have two dormers at the front and two at the back. Erection of the porch (line with the existing bay windows).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

2. The proposed development relates to various extensions to the existing property, including a single storey rear extension to replace existing rear extensions and roof alterations and extension, including raising the roof. The Council's reason for refusal relates solely to the roof works and from all the information before me and my site visit, I have no reason to take a different view.
3. Accordingly, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed roof alterations and extension on the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached bungalow on the south side of Willow Grove towards its eastern end; this is a no-through road with pedestrian access into Shenley Park, and within a predominantly residential area. Willow Grove comprises mainly detached, together with a small number of semi-detached, bungalows, some of which have been extended and altered to include accommodation in the roof space.
5. At roof level, the proposal would include extensions and alterations to change from a hipped to gable / half hipped end together with a raising of the ridge and installation of 2 front and 2 rear dormers.

6. Approaching Willow Grove from Eversley Crescent there is a noticeable change in scale of the individual properties, starting with mainly two storey houses, reducing to a mix of two storey, chalet bungalows and bungalows with a predominance of more modest bungalows along Willow Grove some of which have been extended and altered to include accommodation in the roof space. Depending on the design of the individual property, there are some with small front facing dormers, but others have incorporated a hipped to gable roof alteration with front roof lights and a rear dormer, including the two adjacent properties to the east of the appeal property. The street scene within most of Willow Grove, and particularly towards its eastern end, remains of more modest properties, with similar ridge heights.
7. The proposed raising of the roof ridge would be out of step with and disrupt the current pattern of development along the street. It would become visually over prominent in relation to the neighbouring properties and within the street scene. The adverse effect on the street scene would be exacerbated with the introduction of the two large dormers on the front roof slope. The combined effect would result in the property, as proposed to be extended, becoming very bulky at roof level and overly dominant in the street scene. The proposal would be visually incongruous with the predominant pattern of development and materially harm the street scene.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would materially harm the street scene. This would conflict with 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 (2020), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework and in particular Section 12, all of which amongst other matters, seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.

Other Considerations

9. The Appellant has drawn my attention to a number of other extensions and alterations to properties in the local area, mainly in Willow Grove and Eversley Crescent. Each proposal must be considered on its individual merits, but I have nonetheless taken these other developments into account. However, for the reasons set out above they do not lead me to different conclusion in the particular circumstances of this case.
10. I have sympathy with the Appellant's family related reasons for seeking to extend his property, but these considerations would not outweigh the harm that I have found from the particular proposal before me.
11. I have also taken into account the range of permitted development rights, including via prior approval, but I am required to determine this proposal on the basis that it has been submitted, and given the harm I have concluded these rights do not persuade me to a different conclusion.

Conclusion

12. There are no other material considerations which would justify me making a decision other than in accordance with development plan policy. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR