

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 September 2021

by Rebecca McAndrew BA Hons, PG Dip Urban Design, MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 October 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3275876

8 Croft Close, Uxbridge, London UB10 9LJ

- 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 & Mrs Omar Nadhmi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 27798/APP/2021/132, dated 4 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'dormer to side'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the Council's decision notice as it more accurately reflects the appeal proposal than that used on the planning application form.
3. A revised National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') has been published since the appeal was made. I have considered the appeal accordingly. In doing so, I am satisfied that no injustice will be caused since the relevant policies which seek to deliver good design are essentially the same as in the previous plan.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Reasons

5. The appeal scheme proposes the construction of a dormer roof extension to the side roof plane of a two-storey detached house. Given the height, depth and bulk of the proposed dormer extension, it would dominate the roof plane within which it would sit and would be unacceptably prominent when viewed from the public realm.
6. Croft Close is a cul de sac which is characterised by a mixture of bungalows and two storey dwellings. Whilst on my site visit, I observed that the bungalows in Croft Close vary in design and mostly benefit from dormer roof extensions. By contrast the houses in Croft Close are identical in design and their side roof planes remain unaltered. Therefore, the introduction of a side

dormer extension into the unaltered roof plane of the appeal house would be at odds with both the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the neighbouring houses. In view of the above, the proposed side dormer roof extension would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and Croft Close.

7. I have considered the details of other properties in Croft Close submitted by the appellants in support of their proposals. I note that the majority of these examples benefit from dormer roof extensions, and one has rendered external walls whilst other properties in the cul de sac are of brick finish. However, the circumstances of the properties referred to vary from the appeal dwelling as they are all bungalows. Therefore, I have attached limited weight to these examples in considering the appeal.
8. In conclusion, the appeal would conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020), London Plan (2020) Policies D1 and D3 and Paragraph 130 of the Framework which, taken together, seek to secure good quality design which reflects existing character and context.

Other matters

9. Whilst I note that the appeal proposal would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, this does not form part of the Council's reason for refusal. Consequently, this would not outweigh the harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR