



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2025

by **B J Sims BSc (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3348899

14 Burton Road, Uxbridge, Hillingdon, UB10 0YE.

- 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 Razvan Hilihor against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon Council.
 - The application Ref is 77124/APP/2024/1256.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a loft conversion with rear dormer and the erection of a ground floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed rear dormer on the character and appearance of No 14 Burton Road and whether, after the construction of the rear extension, the remaining private amenity space would be adequate.

Reasons

Dormer – Character and Appearance

3. The proposed dormer, at about two thirds of the width of the house, set down from the ridge and above the eaves, would comply with the strict dimensional limits of Policy DMHD1 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan (HLP). It would also be invisible in frontal views from Burton Road.
4. However, it would be the only dormer in the terrace, and readily seen from many properties in the residential area to the rear. From there, it would appear as an incongruous addition, out of keeping with the terrace as a whole and harmful to its currently simple and harmonious character and appearance.
5. For this reason, the proposed dormer would be in unacceptable conflict with Policies BE1 and DMHB11 of the HLP. as well as D3 of the adopted London Plan, which, together, require high quality design in the built environment for new construction, including home extensions, to integrate well in the surrounding area.

Rear Extension – Private Amenity Space

6. The rear extension too, at 3.3m deep, would comply with the dimensional limit of Policy DMHD1.

7. Importantly, however, its presence would reduce the existing area of private amenity space at the rear of the dwelling from about 48sqm to some 32sqm. That is compared with the requirement of Policy DMHB18 of the HLP for 2- and 3-bedroom dwellings to have 60sqm of private amenity space. Even the present rear yard, or garden, would not appear to comply with this standard. By increasing the number of bedrooms from two to three, compliance with the policy minimum is logically more important. In my view, therefore, the remaining private amenity space would be inadequate and in unacceptable conflict with Policy DMHB18.

Conclusion

8. The development plan provisions I have cited above are essentially consistent with national policy and, for the reasons given, I regard the proposed dormer and rear extension together as failing to comply with the development plan as a whole.
9. Accordingly, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

B J Sims

INSPECTOR