
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 June 2026 by S Manson DipTP MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd July 2026

Appeal Ref: 6006532

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 failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by James Tupman against the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 79176/APP/2025/2905.
 - The development proposed is described as “Demolish front garage. New two storey front extension with ground floor side projection. Ground floor porch. Convert roof to rooms. Rooflights to front. Dormer to rear. Relocate vehicular crossover”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused for the demolition of the garage, the two-storey extension with ground floor side projection, porch on the eastern elevation and relocation of the vehicular crossover.
2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the dormer window and rooflight on the western elevation, three rooflights on the eastern elevation and window in the second-storey southern elevation at 34 Pepys Close, Ickenham UB10 8NY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 79176/APP/2025/2905, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with approved plans DRG No. 2438.2 REV F and DRG No. 2438.3 REV D insofar as they relate to the dormer window and rooflight on the western elevation, the three rooflights on the eastern elevation and the window in the second storey southern elevation only.
 - 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Appeal Procedure

3. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

4. Due to the site's corner plot position, there is a degree of ambiguity in identifying the principal front, rear and side elevations. For clarity, I have referred to the elevations by their cardinal directions in the decision paragraphs.
5. The appeal is submitted on the grounds that the Council failed to give notice of its decision within the appropriate time period. It has since been confirmed that the scheme would have been refused, and reasons therefore have been given. These have informed the main issue, which is whether or not the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ickenham Village Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling with a double garage attached to the side. The dwelling is positioned prominently on a bend within a cul-de-sac, which is formed of comparable detached dwellings and a small development of two-storey blocks of flats within landscaped grounds. The dwelling contrasts with the orientation of neighbouring properties that share the same front and rear garden alignments, as they present their ridge lines parallel to the street.
7. Notwithstanding this variation, the appeal property shares a consistent architectural language with the remainder of the street, including buff brick elevations, pitched gable roofs and similarly proportioned fenestration, resulting in a cohesive suburban character. The consistency in scale, coupled with generally limited and sympathetic alterations, and comparable roof forms, lend a pleasant consistency and originality to the street which contributes positively to the architectural significance of the CA.
8. The appeal scheme represents a revised iteration of a previously refused proposal that was subsequently dismissed at appeal. I recognise that the proposals for this appeal, including setting the two-storey side extension away from the boundary and introducing a hipped roof form, are intended to reduce the perceived bulk and visual prominence of the proposed two-storey addition. However, these changes would give rise to a form that appears contrived rather than a natural evolution of the host dwelling.
9. Whilst the proposed hipped roof would lessen the massing to some extent, it would appear at odds with the prevailing built form, where strong gabled roof profiles are a consistent and defining characteristic of the immediate street scene. As a result, the proposal would disrupt this established pattern. Of the cited examples, only limited information has been provided. They are located within the wider area in materially different site contexts. The extended roof forms on those dwellings are well integrated designs for that style and design of dwelling. In the absence of full planning histories, it is unclear under what policy context or design considerations these developments were permitted, or whether they pre-date the adoption of the current design policies.
10. The relationship between the two-storey extension and the ground floor side projection, along with the almost curved porch would appear fragmented. Rather than forming a coherent composition, these elements would read as successive additions, giving the development an unduly additive appearance. This lack of

cohesion would fail to respect the simple and unified architectural character of the street.

11. As a result of the above therefore, these elements of the proposals would harm the significance of the CA which would neither preserve nor enhance its character or appearance. This harm would be, owing to its localised effect, at the lower end of less than substantial for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework). Nevertheless, it is a matter of considerable weight and importance. In such circumstances, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
12. The proposed side extensions would increase living accommodation for the existing occupiers and although there would be some economic public benefit, during construction, this would be time limited in its effect. Ultimately, the mainstay of the benefits would be private. Therefore, the public benefits in this instance carry only very limited weight that would, by definition, be insufficient to outweigh the harm to the CA.
13. As such, the above proposed elements would conflict with Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies, 2021 (LP1); Policies DMHB 4, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management, 2020 (LP2) and Policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan, Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, 2021 (SDS). Taken together, these policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development responds positively to local character, is well integrated with its surroundings, and conserves the historic environment.
14. The Council does not object to the proposed dormer or other windows, and I have no reason to disagree. It would be positioned on the western elevation and, given its location, would not appear prominent within the wider street scene, being largely limited to views obtained directly in front of the property. It would be modestly sized in the context of the existing roof and through using a simple unfussy shape would reflect the modern feel of the host dwelling. The lack of harm in this respect would ensure that the character and appearance of the CA would be preserved.
15. Therefore, I find that the proposed dormer window and rooflights would be consistent with Policies BE1 and HE1 of the LP1; Policies DMHB 4, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the LP2 and Policies D3 and HC1 of the SDS. Together, and amongst other things, these seek to ensure that development responds positively to local character, is well integrated with its surroundings, and conserves the historic environment.

Other Matters

16. I am satisfied that the proposed dormer overcomes the concerns regarding loss of privacy raised in appeal 3364612. It would contain only a single, small window, which would face directly onto a blank wall, with an additional window inserted into the southern elevation in order to provide natural light to the bedroom. Given their siting and orientation, neither window would result in unacceptable overlooking beyond that already experienced from existing south-facing first-floor windows.
17. The appeal process is not intended to serve as a means to evolve or revise a scheme. It must be determined based on the proposal submitted to the Council and made available for public consultation. Whilst the apparent lack of engagement

from the Council has caused frustration, these matters are between the main parties and do not affect my consideration of the main issue.

18. There is no substantive evidence before me to indicate that the proposal is intended for anything other than use as a single family dwelling. The internal layout and potential use of rooms, including as a gym or otherwise, is a matter for the occupiers and does not, in itself, give rise to any material planning harm or justification for withholding permission in this case.
19. Taking into account the positioning, design and separation distances involved, I am satisfied that the roof lights on the eastern elevation would not result in any material overlooking or unacceptable loss of privacy to occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Conditions

20. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, I have set out a condition requiring the dormer window, second-storey window and rooflights to accord with the approved plans for enforcement purposes. A condition requiring the use of materials matching that of the existing building is also necessary to ensure an appropriate appearance for the development. I have not imposed a condition requiring the dormer window to be obscurely glazed. As the window would not result in unacceptable overlooking of neighbouring gardens and, given its siting, it would not itself be directly overlooked. Moreover, as it would serve a bathroom, it is likely that obscure glazing would be incorporated in any event.

Conclusion and Recommendation

21. The appeal proposal includes different elements. I have concluded that the dormer window and rooflights would not have a harmful impact upon the character or appearance of the CA. However, the two-storey extension with ground floor side projection, and porch elements of the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan, and material considerations do not indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith.
22. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed in respect of the dormer window, rooflights and window in the second-storey, and that the appeal should be dismissed in respect of the two-storey side extension with ground floor side projection and porch.

S Manson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

23. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is determined as a split decision, in the terms set out above.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR