



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2023

by P Terceiro BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3324578

78 Roseville Road, Hayes, Hillingdon UB3 4QZ

- 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 B Sagoo against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 29767/APP/2023/435, dated 14 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and of the area; and
 - whether the proposal would create satisfactory living conditions for its future occupiers with regard to outdoor space.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey detached dwelling, which has been substantially extended to the rear. In addition, there is a large outbuilding located in the rear garden taking up a significant proportion of the plot.
4. The roofscape in the vicinity is varied and includes elements such as hipped roofs, cat slides and gables. The site lies on the corner of Roseville Road and Hillborne Close and, as such, it occupies a prominent position with its side and rear elevations visible within the street scene of Hillborne Close. The back of the adjoining plots are also visible in this street scene and some dwellings have been enlarged with ground and first floor rear extensions.
5. The proposed development would be substantial in size, thereby failing to appear as a subservient addition to the host dwelling. Due to the extension's significant width, the design of the hipped roof would create a disparity of angles with the pitch of the main roof. Consequently, the roof form would appear convoluted and fail to reflect the existing architectural detailing of the host dwelling.

6. The proposal would be prominent in views within Hillborne Close. Given its bulk and design, it would be markedly at odds with the less substantial amount of built form in the rear of neighbouring properties, including the first-floor rear extension at 80 Roseville Road (No 80). That extension is not as substantial in size as the proposal and, in addition, it maintains the roof slope of its host dwelling. For these reasons, the proposal would not be justified by the extension at No 80.
7. The proposal would not be detrimental to the living conditions of the adjoining neighbours. However, the lack of harm is a neutral consideration of this appeal.
8. In conclusion, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and of the area. The proposal would conflict with Policies DMHD1, DMHB11 and DMHB12 of the Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies (DMP), Policy BE1 of the Local Plan Part 1 - Strategic Policies 2012 and Policies D4 and D8 of the London Plan 2021, where these policies support high quality design that integrates well with the surrounding area. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which promotes developments that are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Living conditions

9. The site retains some space to the rear which is laid to hardstanding and appears to be used for parking. Nevertheless, the space remains available and, as such, the increase in number of bedrooms would not reduce the standard of accommodation. In addition, the site is well located in relation to public amenity space.
10. On this basis, the proposal would create satisfactory living conditions for its future occupiers with regard to outdoor space. As such, it would not conflict with Policy DMHD1 of the DMP, which amongst other criteria, requires that adequate garden space is retained when dwellings are extended.

Conclusion

11. Overall, I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate that a decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

P Terceiro

INSPECTOR