



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 June 2023

by **Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3318062

60 Bempton Drive, Ruislip, Hillingdon HA4 9DD

- 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 Bekim Mehmeti against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 77291/APP/2022/3828 dated 19 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 February 2023.
- The development proposed is a single storey front extension, hip to gable extension, rear dormer and 2 x front facing roof lights (alongside approved application ref 77291/APP/2022/1686 for the erection of a two storey side extension and a part single storey, part two storey rear extension).

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council changed the description of development from that stated on the application form in the interests of clarity. I consider that the amended description with a minor alteration accurately describes the appeal scheme accordingly I have adopted the amended description in the heading above.
3. At the time of my site visit, the development was complete. The application made clear that the scheme was submitted on part retrospectively and I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.
4. The submitted plans do not accurately reflect the as built development for instance there are minor alterations in terms of the fenestration to the rear, three rooflights are proposed to the front of the main roof rather than two, and the single storey front extension has a mono pitched roof rather than a flat roof. Also the rear dormer is not accurately depicted on the submitted plans, the as built dormer is not set in from the edge of the roof above the two storey extension, it is also higher than shown on the plan connecting to the ridge of the main roof.
5. It is clear from the information I have before me that the Council based their considerations on a mixture of the plans submitted and what has been built on the site, as they reference a flat roof front extension rather than the as built mono pitched roof and three rooflights as opposed to the two detailed on the submitted plan.

Main Issue

6. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of host property and the area in general.

Reasons

7. The site is an end terraced two storey property within a predominantly terraced residential area. Properties in a terraced block share design characteristics, end of terraced properties largely comprise hipped roofs.
8. I understand that a similar two-storey side, part single storey and part two-storey rear extensions have previously been approved¹. However, the single storey front extension, hip to gable extension, rear dormer and roof lights are new additions to the property.
9. The two-storey side, part single storey and part two-storey rear extensions are in general sympathetic to the host property. The single storey front extension as built with a mono pitched roof is similar to others within the immediate area, and does not appear at odds to the host property or surrounding area however a flat roof front extension as shown on the submitted plans would be out of keeping.
10. The hip to gable alteration ties into the substantial dormer extension to the rear, creating an asymmetrical gable with the main roof and the dormer extension. The roof of the two storey side extension connects to the gable forming a hipped roof at the end of the terrace, although it does not extend up to the ridge but rather links to a gable this does provide a small hipped roof in recognition of the surrounding properties.
11. Nevertheless the development in combination is not subservient to the host property, the bulk of the dormer and gable create a disproportionate addition to the property resulting in an incongruous form of development.
12. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area in general. There is conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon's A Vision for 2026, Local Plan: Part 1, Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHD 12, DMHD 1 and DMHD 2 the Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020), Policy D4 the London Plan (2021) which amongst other things seek to ensure developments are of high quality design which respect the scale of the original property and surrounding area.
13. There is conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) which seeks amongst other things to ensure developments are of good design which adds to the overall quality of an area.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR

¹ 77291/APP/2022/1686