

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 July 2022 by R Dickson BSc (hons) MSc

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3297373

57 Tudor Way, Hillingdon, Uxbridge UB10 9AA

- 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 Ajmeet Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 20951/APP/2022/290, dated 31 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey side extension, part single part double storey rear extension, roof extension following rear dormer and side roof slope windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Tudor Way is a wide linear road with detached and semi-detached properties of a similar age and of a similar design language. Some properties on Tudor Way have had rear extensions that have altered the roof form, and these are evident from the road. However, the extended side elevations can only be seen when near to each property, and are not easily visible from a distance, owing to the close proximity of neighbouring properties.
5. Tudor Way has a diverse roofscape. The larger extensions which have altered the roof form have become a part of the character of the north side of Tudor Way (properties with even numbers). However, many of the properties on the south side (odd numbers) have retained most of their original roof forms, even in instances where a rear extension has been added. Extensions of a similar footprint have been achieved in neighbouring

properties to the appeal site, which appear as a subservient addition to the host dwelling and do not have a significant impact on the street scene.

6. The appeal site itself is a well-proportioned detached property with a mock Tudor design. The proposed extension would significantly elongate the main ridge. The formation of a crown roof would not be particularly obvious, and there is no policy requirement for the ridge to be lower than that of the original property. However, the additional depth of the proposed extension, at the same height as the existing ridge and extending across the full width of the rear elevation, would create significant additional bulk and mass to the rear of the property. Consequently, it would not respect the proportions of the original property and would not appear to be subordinate to the main dwelling in terms of width, depth and height. Furthermore, the original modest hipped roof form would be significantly altered, further eroding the proportions of the original property.
7. While the extension would not be seen from a distance, when close to the property, the additional depth would be evident from the road. It would negatively impact on the street scene on this side, where such in-depth extensions are not part of the established character.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to other examples of similar extensions to that proposed, in particular Nos 56 and 79. These were determined under a Local Plan which has since been superseded, however from the summaries provided there appear to be similarities between the policy requirements then and now. Nevertheless, No 56 is on the other side of the road where rear extensions and deeper roofs are more common than around the appeal property. For No 79 the Council identified the visibility of the changes to the roof, but that was considered in the context of similar lengths of roof on two neighbouring properties. This contributed to the conclusion that the scheme would be in keeping with the existing street scene. This is not the case here however, where neighbouring properties have similar modest roofs to that of the host property. The context of these examples is therefore different to that of the appeal scheme.
9. I have been referred to other examples of similar extensions elsewhere in the area, however I am not aware of the circumstances leading to these developments being built. Nor are they so numerous as to have materially changed the character of this side of the road. I therefore attach limited weight to these examples, and they do not justify the harm I have identified.
10. The proposed side extension would not add any further bulk or massing to the front of the property and would have a similar roofline to the existing garage, with the addition of two roof windows. The garage door would be changed to a window, which is quite common in the area. The conversion of the garage to living space would not harm the character or appearance of either the street scene or the host property. However, this would not lessen the harm that would be caused by the proposed rear extension.
11. Accordingly, the proposed two storey rear extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. It would therefore conflict with Policies DMHD1 and DMHB11 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) which require new extensions to respect the design of the original house,

appear subordinate to the main dwelling, and harmonise with the local context.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Dickson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and agree with the recommendation. On that basis the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR