



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5th September 2023

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3322717

1 Grove Close, Ickenham, Uxbridge UB10 8QN

- 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 Arandeep Gill against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref.6206/APP/2023/345, dated 3 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 27 March 2023.
 - The development is a part single storey, part double storey rear extension, first floor side extension and a garage conversion. Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 3 front roof lights, a rear dormer and conversion of roof from hip to gable end and alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The development sought has already taken place and the planning application is retrospective. I have determined the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans. However, it is important to note that the development which has taken place which I viewed on my site visit does not entirely match the submitted plans.
3. The description of development in the heading is taken mainly from the Decision Notice as there was no description given on the Application Form.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the roof alterations and extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, its semi-pair and the streetscene.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is situated on the south side of Grove Close which is a small cul-de-sac. It is a semi-detached dwelling and its semi-pair is no.3 Grove Close to its west. The eastern boundary of the site is adjacent to a number of rear gardens of dwellings in The Grove.
6. The dwelling as it presented at the time of my site visit, had a main gabled roof with 3 front rooflights and a two storey side element also with a gabled roof, with a ridge that sat at a slightly lower level than the ridge of the main roof.

Within the rear of the main roof there was a large dormer structure with two south-facing windows. There was a full width ground floor rear extension with glazing facing the garden. Towards the eastern end of that extension was a first floor side extension with its own hipped roof, sitting below the roof ridges.

7. In 2022 planning permission was granted for the erection of a first-floor side extension, single storey rear and part double storey rear extension, conversion of garage space to habitable room and internal alterations (Application ref. 6206/APP/2022/608). This retained a hipped roof profile as opposed to a gable end profile from the front as well as the rear.
8. The development for which planning permission is sought retrospectively includes a part single storey, part double storey rear extension, first floor side extension and a garage conversion, conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 3 front roof lights, a rear dormer and conversion of roof from hip to gable end. Alterations to fenestration are also sought.
9. The main focus of the appeal relates to the roof alterations and extensions. In respect of the appearance of the dwelling from the front, the gable end roof design is unsympathetic, gives a top heavy appearance and does not read as a subordinate addition to the host dwelling. The roof alterations have resulted in an expanse of roof and a roof profile which unbalances the dwelling when viewed with its semi-pair (no.3) from the front. No.3 Grove Close has been extended to the side but the hipped roof profile has been maintained. Looking more widely within the cul-de-sac, the hipped roof profile is prevalent and is a broadly uniform characteristic of the streetscene. Other examples of side extensions in the cul-de-sac even those which include roof additions are more skilfully designed and considered, relating closely to their neighbour to ensure a sense of balance from the front. The appeal site does not reflect these characteristics or consistency. It is harmful to the two semi-detached dwellings when viewed together, as well as harmful to the wider streetscene.
10. Turning to the rear, the dormer structure is a significant and domineering presence. It conflicts with policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (adopted 2020) which, amongst other things, indicates that a dormer should not exceed more than two thirds the average width of the original roof and should retain a substantial element of the original roof slope above the eaves line. The dormer has a flat roof and engulfs much of the rear main roof slope. It is box-like and stark and draws the eye, disrupting the proportions of the dwelling's rear elevation. The overdeveloped appearance of the rear of the property is exacerbated by the hipped roof over the side/rear first floor extension as this brings in an additional roof profile to add to the plethora of roof forms. In short, there is a poorly designed combination of roof extensions.
11. In making these judgements I have borne in mind that there is an extant planning permission dated 2022. However, that scheme maintains the main roof hip and the side extension would also have a hip. It would be a significantly more sympathetic scheme than the one which has taken place. I have borne in mind that the Appellant says that following the grant of the 2022 permission and prior to the works taking place he utilised permitted development rights under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B. It is said "the proposed works were undertaken in isolation and altered the original roof profile from a hip-to-gable including dormer window along the rear roof profile". No evidence

to support this statement is produced and there is no evidence of whether or not permitted development tolerances have been met. Nevertheless, I have taken into account that use of Class B permitted development rights would have allowed the pre-existing main roof to change to a gable end, and for a rear dormer which met the tolerances to be constructed. However, this does not lead me to conclude that the development which has taken place and is the subject of the appeal is acceptable.

12. Consequently, I conclude that the roof alterations and extensions harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, its semi-pair and the wider streetscene. There is conflict with policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (adopted November 2012), policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (adopted January 2020) and policy D3 of the London Plan 2021.

Conclusion

13. Having taken into account all representations made, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.

INSPECTOR