



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2023

by M J Francis BA (Hons) MA MSc MCIfrA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3326181

1 Heatherfold Way, Eastcote, Hillingdon HA5 2LG

- 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 J Bakrania against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 66946/APP/2023/1350, dated 10 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is addition of dormer to rear roof of integral garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council amended the description which the appellant contends is incorrect. As the description of development on the application form and as included in the banner heading above, adequately reflects what is shown on the plans, I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - Whether the proposal would be inappropriate in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies; and
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Inappropriate development

4. The appeal site is located in the Green Belt. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts with the essential characteristics being their openness and their permanence. Paragraph 149 of the Framework states that the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt, although lists a number of exceptions. This includes at 149 c) 'the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building'.
5. The proposal would be an extension to an original dwelling, which the parties consider would not result in disproportionate additions. It would therefore accord with Policy DME1 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2, Development Management Policies, 2020, (DMP) which includes amongst other things that

extensions in the Green Belt must not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt, and the purposes of including land within it. It would also accord with chapter 13 of the Framework.

Character and appearance

6. The appeal site is a corner property within a small development of detached, two-storey houses on Heatherfold Way. Whilst the housing is a mixture of styles, it is built of brick, with tiled roofs. It additionally has a number of architectural features, including decorative hanging tiles, large chimneys, and areas of render, which gives the development a unified and cohesive design.
7. Number 1 overlooks fields to the front, with the flank wall running parallel to Wiltshire Lane. This wall is partially covered in red, decorative hanging tiles, with a tall brick chimney. The house is characterised by half-hipped features to the roof, with clay finials. It has a two-storey front projection, with further hanging tiles and a half timber feature. To the side is an attached garage with a half-hipped roof which wraps around the front of the property. This has a velux window to the front which serves a workshop reached from an internal staircase.
8. The proposed plans show that a dormer would be added to the rear roof slope, and the existing roof to the garage would be enlarged to form a gable. This roof currently shadows the shape of the roof on the main part of the house, which is pleasingly mirrored in the roofscape of the adjoining property, No 2 Heatherfold Way. Altering this to a gable would change the proportions and unbalance the roofscape, which is an important part of the architectural design.
9. The expansive flat roof of the proposed dormer, which would extend from just below the apex of the garage roof, would create a top-heavy development, unsympathetic to the character of the house. Although it would be constructed of matching materials, the roofscape is currently pitched. Therefore, the introduction of a large flat roof would be uncharacteristic of the existing roof form and appear incongruous in this location.
10. The appeal site is in a prominent corner location at the top of Wiltshire Lane which rises towards the site. The house is, therefore, higher than those houses located to the rear of it. As the proposal is on the rear of the dwelling, it would be visible from those properties and Wiltshire Lane. The introduction of this unsympathetic addition, would, therefore, when viewed from nearby locations, detract from the existing character of this well-designed house.
11. Consequently, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would not accord with Policy BE1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Part 1 Strategic Policies, 2012, which requires high quality design in all new buildings, alterations and extensions. It would also not accord with Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the DMP which amongst other things requires new extensions to respect the design of the original house and harmonise with the local context. Furthermore, it would not accord with Policy D3 of the London Plan which requires development to respond to local distinctiveness.

Conclusion

12. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

M J Francis

INSPECTOR