



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2025

by **S Simms BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/25/3364612

34 Pepys Close, Ickenham, UB10 8NY

- 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 James Tupman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application ref. is 79176/APP/2024/3066.
- The development proposed is the erection of part single storey, part two storey front extension, and a front porch, following demolition of existing attached garage. Conversion of the roof space into habitable rooms including a rear dormer, 4 x front facing roof lights and 1 x rear facing roof light, and relocation of vehicular crossover.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal form has been completed using the description of development on the decision notice. I have taken this as agreement to the amended description and decided the appeal on that basis.
3. The appeal site is within the Ickenham Village Conservation Area (CA) wherein I have a statutory duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including the effect on the Ickenham Village CA.

Reasons

5. The site is a corner plot containing a detached two-storey house in buff brick with a timber clad bay, dual pitched roof, attached double garage and monopitch canopy porch. The roof of the garage is also dual pitched, and its ridge runs into the side of the main house just below the eaves. Neighbouring houses present gables to the site, the nearest across a gap of about three metres containing two parallel side accesses separated by a fence.
6. The site is within Ickenham Village CA and an area subject to a Tree Preservation Order. No trees or specific features of significance have been identified that would be affected, but this cul-de-sac section of Pepys Close contains similar houses to the subject to one side and two storey blocks of maisonette flats across. These are

set back from the street within soft landscape, including protected trees. Together with the lack of through traffic, this creates a quiet, spacious, sylvan feel.

7. The proposal would effectively extend over the front part of the attached garage to create an upper storey in line with the rear wall of the main house. This would have a smaller dual pitch roof with a blank side gable facing the street. The back of the garage would remain single storey, and an enclosed porch would replace the canopy. A dormer would be installed to the main roof slope facing the nearest neighbour and rooflights would be inserted into the slope facing the street.
8. The effect of the two-storey extension would be to create additional bulk at height, close to the street at the side, and across around a further two-thirds the width of the main house as seen from the front, albeit set back. Located on the outside of the street corner, it would be visible from several locations. The rooflights would be seen in conjunction with this and would further complicate the roof.
9. As there are no two-storey buildings so close to the street nearby, this would both introduce an uncharacteristic feature and erode spaciousness. Nearby attached garages have been converted and extended over, but these are single width and located between houses. Consequently, the additional width seen from the front would also appear excessive, prominent and uncharacteristic.
10. The dormer would be inserted across roughly the rear two-thirds of the main roof, facing the gable and rear garden of the nearest house. Whilst further closing the gap between these two houses, it would not be visible from the outside of the corner and the neighbouring house would restrict its visibility from the front. The rearmost window would, however, overlook neighbouring gardens.
11. Recent development at 21 Pepys Close differs from the proposal in that the side extension, whilst sited closer to the street than the house, is single storey and its flat-roofed form further reduces its visibility to the street. The permitted dormer is more visible but appears to have been implemented in amended form to reduce its width and locate it further away from the street.
12. The permission at 26 Pepys Close differs from the proposal in that the site is not a corner plot, so that an extension over the garage would be much less prominent from the street. The main roof is also oriented differently so that the rear dormer would face the rear garden. This means that it both could not be seen from the street and would not directly overlook neighbouring gardens.
13. Overall, the proposal development would harm the character and appearance of the area and cause less than substantial harm to the CA. Paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset (in this case the CA) should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposed development.
14. Whilst additional capacity and flexibility would be introduced to the housing stock, and this may be of some limited public benefit, this does not outweigh the great weight that should be given to the CA's conservation.
15. Moreover, the harm would be contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2021), DMHB 4, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management (2020) and D3 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021).

16. These policies require, amongst other things, that development contributes to local character and distinctiveness in terms of form and scale and is well integrated with the surrounding area. They require side extensions to not exceed half the width of the original property and maintain the openness of corner plots.

Other Matters

17. Whilst requiring the rearmost windows in the dormer to be obscure glazed would afford privacy to neighbouring occupiers using their rear garden, I am concerned that this would result in inadequate living conditions for future occupiers of that part of the dormer in terms of outlook. Consequently, I do not consider it appropriate to split the decision with a condition to that effect.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

S Simms

INSPECTOR