



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17th June 2024

by Megan Thomas K.C. Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3342242

34 Leybourne Road, Uxbridge, Hillingdon UB10 9HD

- 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 Ms Fengzhu Zhou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref. is 7946/APP/2024/98.
- The development proposed is the erection of a front porch, single storey rear and a double storey side extension. Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a hip to gable end extension, rear dormer and front roof lights.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. In the box heading above I have used the description of development from the Council's Notice of Decision rather than the description on the planning application form. This is because the former is expressed slightly more clearly than the latter.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the hip to gable extension, dormer roof form and double storey side extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, nearby property and the streetscene.
4. The proposed development by reason of its combined hip to gable extension, double storey side extension and resultant roof form would be unduly prominent, visually incongruous and unsympathetic to the original architectural composition of the host dwelling, resulting in a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the original dwelling and would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the immediate street scene and surrounding area. The proposal thereby fails to comply with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part OneStrategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling facing onto the junction of Leybourne Road and Grosvenor Crescent. Its semi-pair is 189 Grosvenor Crescent and together they form one corner of the two roads. The appeal property is north of 189 Grosvenor Crescent. Both have wedge-shaped rear gardens and their frontages stand back from the corner.
6. The appeal site has a hipped roof form and a very shallow two storey side projection. 189 Grosvenor Crescent has been extended including the construction of a two storey recessed element with a crown roof with rooflights.
7. The surrounding area is residential in character comprising mainly semi-detached and terraced properties. Many have been extended including by constructing rear dormer structures.
8. The proposed development includes a single storey rear extension and a replacement front porch. Neither of these elements would cause harm to the appearance or character of the host dwelling or the nearby properties or streetscene.
9. The appeal site has the benefit of a Certificate of Lawful Proposed Development (ref.7946/APP/2021/4068) for a hip-to-gable roof extension and rear dormer. It also has an extant planning permission (ref.7946/APP/2023/2960) for a two-storey side extension, single-storey rear extension and front porch. Each scheme could be constructed separately but both schemes would not be lawful development.
10. Amongst the policies relevant to this case is policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (adopted 2020) which states that alterations and extensions to dwellings should not have an adverse cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, and should appear subordinate to the main dwelling. In respect of proposed side extensions the same policy at (C)(vi) states that where hip to gable roof extensions exist, a two storey side extension will not be supported.
11. No hip to gable roof extension and rear dormer exist at the moment at the appeal site, but it is necessary to consider the impacts of the proposed two storey side extension with a hip to gable roof and rear dormer as shown in the submitted plans. My view is that the proposed side extension would not integrate well with main dwelling once it has had a hip to gable extension and dormer constructed (or vice versa). The side extension would appear as an add-on particularly from the rear where the side extension would not sufficiently integrate or meld with the main dwelling. This would be particularly harmful at roof level where the varied roof profiles (including the sizeable dormer cheek) would be discordant. Overall it would be unsympathetic to the original architectural composition of the host dwelling.
12. In addition, the cumulative effect of the proposed roof extension/dormer and the double storey side addition, would result in a disproportionate addition which would appear overly bulky and would fail to be subordinate to the original dwelling. They would add to the lack of balance between the appeal property and its semi-pair and owing to the prominent corner plot the proposed development would be readily visible in the streetscene and tend to draw the eye, to the detriment of the pleasant rhythm of the streetscene.

13. I have had regard to other extensions which have taken place in the vicinity of the site and I have noted the comments of an Inspector in relation to, inter alia, policy DMHD 1(C)(vi) on a different site in Uxbridge for a different proposal. However, I have determined this appeal on its own individual merits and nothing I have seen or read leads me to conclude that this proposal should be allowed.

14. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed hip to gable extension, dormer roof form and double storey side extension would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, nearby property and the streetscene. It would conflict with policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (adopted 2012), policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (adopted 2020) and policy D3 of the London Plan (2021).

Conclusion

15. Having taken into account all representations made, including those relating to making the best use of land, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.

INSPECTOR