
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2025 by Elizabeth Davies BSc (Hons) MIEMA, CEnv

Decision by M Clowes BA (Hons) MCD PG CERT (Arch Con) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/25/3366721

35 Newcroft Close, Uxbridge, Hillingdon UB8 3RH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr R Kumar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 23577/APP/2025/174.
 - The proposed development is extensions to single family detached dwelling to include; tiled (sloping) roof to replace flat roof over existing ground floor bay, porch and garage; reposition front door (on porch) to face front; garage conversion to include replacing garage door with window and brick to match existing; double storey side to rear extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

3. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the planning application form as there is no evidence before me that the appellant agreed to that contained on the Council's decision notice.
4. The Council has not raised any concerns in respect of the proposed garage conversion, the addition of single storey pitched roofs to the front elevation and the single storey rear extension. From the evidence before me, I have no reason to take a different view.
5. Therefore, the main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed 2-storey side extension, alterations to the roof pitch and installation of dormer windows on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the wider area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site comprises a detached two storey property constructed of brick under a pyramidal style roof, set back behind a small front garden. It is located in a residential area with a mixed character arising from a variety of terraced, semi and detached dwellings of differing architectural styles. Roofs are typically plain in appearance, with chimneys the only noticeable feature. With a similarly unadorned

roofscape, the appeal site contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.

7. Criterion E(i) of Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies (the Local Plan) 2020, is clear that domestic roof extensions should be located on the rear elevation only and be subservient to the scale of the existing roof. The supporting guidance to the policy at paragraph A1.21 reiterates that only rear roof extensions and dormer windows would be considered acceptable.
8. It has been put to me that the proposed alterations to the existing roof would be modest. I acknowledge that there would not be a significant increase in the size of the roof when viewed from within the close. Nonetheless, the plans indicate that the front pitch of the roof would be increased, as well as the width being extended to form a crown roof. The pitching of the main roof further forward would particularly increase its scale, resulting in a dominating and incongruous addition.
9. I observed that the appeal site marks a transition in scale between the modestly proportioned terrace to the south that has a shallower pitched hipped roof, and the more steeply pitched gabled roofs to the north. In combination with the secondary crown roof above the proposed 2-storey side extension and the proposed side dormer window, the alterations would add bulk and mass to the property at roof level when viewed from the close. Even if the proposed dormers could be considered modest, there are no other side facing dormer windows within the street scene. The proposed alterations would not be indiscernible and would render the roof a more dominant feature than is presently the case, such that it could not be considered subordinate.
10. The roof extensions would therefore exacerbate and disrupt the visual change in scale and appearance from the adjacent terrace drawing the eye to a negative degree, even in the context of a varied street scene. I have not been supplied with any street scene drawings or visualisations that would lead me to take a different view.
11. I agree with the appellant that the style of roof proposed is not in itself out of place given the variety of dwelling styles on Newcroft Close. It is the particular scale and form of the proposed roof extensions, in addition to the side dormer that would be out of keeping relative to the original property, the plot size and proportions of neighbouring properties. For this reason, the use of matching materials would not address or mitigate the harm arising from the proposed scale and design.
12. The proposed development would therefore have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the wider area. It would be contrary to Policies DMHB 11 and 12 of the Local Plan which require, amongst other things, that all new development is designed to harmonise with its local context and integrate into its surroundings. It would also be contrary to Policy DMHD 1 of the Local Plan as set out above. The proposal would also fail to accord with Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) which seek, amongst other things, to ensure good design and development that is proportionate.

Other Matters

13. An extant planning permission exists for a first-floor side extension and part 2-storey, part single-storey rear extension at the appeal site. However, the supplied

plans indicate that this scheme does not include any alterations to the size or pitch of the existing pyramidal style roof, nor does it include any dormer windows. The roof of the approved extension also has a lower ridge height than the one now proposed. For these reasons, I am satisfied that the fallback scheme is different and would be less harmful than the proposal now before me. It follows that I am not satisfied that the proposal would result in a superior development than the permitted scheme.

14. I am also directed to a certificate of lawful development for a proposed use, namely the conversion of the existing roof space inclusive of a wraparound 'U' shaped dormer to the sides and rear. I agree that this scheme would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and wider area. However, that does not justify permitting further harmful development. The Council has advised that the certified scheme could not be implemented simultaneously with the approved development. It would not offer the increase in accommodation that the appellant also seeks. For these reasons, I do not consider that there is a greater than theoretical possibility of the certified development taking place.
15. Whilst I understand the appellant may wish to update and improve the appeal property, it has not been demonstrated to me that there would not be less harmful ways of providing additional living accommodation. The appeal property is not within a conservation area or within the curtilage of a listed building. It is also noted that no harm has been found in relation to the amenity of neighbouring properties, private amenity space at the appeal property or parking provision. The absence of harm in these areas is not a factor in the scheme's favour.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, which outweigh this finding. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elizabeth Davies

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Clowes

INSPECTOR