



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2026 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/C/24/3349673

48 Hatch Lane, Harmondsworth, West Drayton UB7 0AZ

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
- The appeal is made by Mr Surinder Singh against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The notice was issued on 16 July 2024.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, the unauthorised erection of a rear dormer roof extension.
- The requirements of the notice are to:
 - (i) Demolish the unauthorised rear dormer roof extension and reinstate the roof to its condition prior to the commencement of unauthorised works, matching as far as reasonably practicable, the same height, slope and appearance as the original dwelling.
 - (ii) Remove from the land all debris, items, fixtures and fittings, plant and machinery resulting from compliance with point (i) above.
- The period for compliance with the requirement is: 3 months.
- The appeal is proceeding on the ground set out in section 174(2)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.

Summary Decision: The appeal is dismissed, the enforcement notice is upheld, and planning permission is refused in the terms set out below in the Formal Decision.

Appeal Procedure

1. 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 Matter

2. There are two enforcement notices in connection with the appeal site. This appeal relates to 'Enforcement Notice A', which is concerned with a rear dormer roof extension.

The Appeal on Ground (a) and the Deemed Planning Application

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Harmondsworth Village Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in the CA. The Harmondsworth Village Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) (2017) identifies that the significance of the CA is primarily derived from its historic core and village centre. This area is generally characterised by a mixture of medieval and post

medieval buildings which are set around the village green. Together, the historic buildings centred around the open space which the village green provides, makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.

5. The appeal site is located outside of the historic core of the CA. It is in an area which is mostly characterised by twentieth century development. Nevertheless, it is amongst a group of semi-detached dwellings along Hatch Lane which are generally similar in their appearance. They tend to have dual pitched roof forms with mostly plain and unaltered roof slopes, aside from roof lights. Although it is not explicitly mentioned in the CAA, from my own observations on my site visit, the consistent roofscape of the dwellings contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area and thus the CA as a whole.
6. The Council's development plan contains some policies which generally seek to protect heritage assets. In particular, Policy DMHD 1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies (2020) (DMP) requires that extensions to dwellings in conservation areas are designed to be in keeping with the original house. Roof extensions in conservation areas should take the form of traditional dormer windows which harmonise with the existing building. In general terms, it also states that roof extensions should be subservient to the scale of the existing roof, should be located below the ridge tiles and should retain a substantial element of the original roof slope above the eaves.
7. Due to its considerable scale and mass, the rear dormer roof extension dominates the entire rear roof slope of the dwelling. It appears unacceptably large and is not subservient to the scale of the original roof. Its bulky flat roof form jars with the dual-pitched roof form of the dwelling, as well as the other roof forms in the locality. Furthermore, its elevated position gives it a conspicuous presence which detracts from the consistency of the roofscape in the area. Consequently, the rear dormer roof extension is an incongruous development which is harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area, including to the CA as a whole.
8. The appellant refers to similar developments in the area. I observed these on my site visit. However, I do not have the full planning background or details of the circumstances in which they were erected. Therefore, I cannot be sure if they represent a direct parallel to the appeal development. Moreover, on my site visit, these developments appeared to be incongruous features in the roofscape. In any case, my recommendation is based on the individual planning merits of the appeal. Accordingly, the developments referred to by the appellant do not justify it and I give this limited weight.
9. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention must be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. For the reasons set out, the development does not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. This has resulted in less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA, given the harm is relatively localised. In accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), less than substantial harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the development.
10. In that regard, there is little information before me which explains the public benefits of the development. Whilst the development may increase the value of the

property, this is not a public benefit for planning purposes. Consequently, there are no public benefits of the development to outweigh the less than substantial harm to the identified heritage asset.

11. I therefore conclude that the development fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. It is contrary to Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 4 and DMHB 11 of the DMP and Policy BE1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (2012). Amongst other matters, these policies require that developments improve and maintain the quality of the built environment and preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas.

Other Matters

12. The absence of objections or complaints from neighbours is a neutral factor which does not weigh in favour of the appeal. Furthermore, the support from neighbours does not overcome the harm identified under the main issue.
13. I also recognise that the appellant would be willing to install obscure glazing on the dormer windows. However, this would not mitigate the adverse effects of the development as are identified in the main issue.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons set out, I conclude that the development is contrary to the development plan. Consequently, I recommend that the appeal on ground (a) should fail and the deemed planning application should be refused.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. The appeal is dismissed, the enforcement notice is upheld and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under Section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended for the development already carried out, namely the erection of a rear dormer roof extension at 48 Hatch Lane, Harmondsworth, West Drayton UB7 0AZ, as shown on the plan attached to the notice.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR