



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 December 2022

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3303935
29 Barnhill Lane, Hayes UB4 9HD

- 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 Daljit Singh Matharu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 18069/APP/2021/2342, dated 9 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is 10 No. solar Panels on top of Flat roof - to an existing dwelling-house. Each Panel is [600mm x 1800mm]. Flat roof area = 3.6m x 4.5m = 16.20 sq. m.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. At the time of my site visit, solar panels which appeared to broadly accord with those on the submitted plans were in place at the site. For the avoidance of doubt my consideration has been made on the basis of the plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the solar panels on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a residential dwelling which sits within the Barnhill Estate Area of Special Local Character (ASLC). The immediate area is formed in the main of modest semi-detached and terraced residential dwellings.
5. The properties are generally formed with hipped or gable roofs with ridgelines that are only exceeded in height by expected features such as chimney stacks and television aerials.
6. The solar panels combine to form a bulky feature which projects well above the main ridgeline of the dwelling. They are visible in views up and down the street, where they form a discordant feature in those views by reason of their prominent projection above the ridgeline.
7. The solar panels are therefore detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and the ASLC.

8. The proposal subsequently conflicts with Policy BE 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 Strategic Policies (2012), policies DMHB 5, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) and policies D4 and D8 of the London Plan (2021).
9. Amongst other things these policies seek well designed proposals that are appropriate to the character of an area. Amongst other matters, the supporting text to Policy DMHD 1 is clear that solar panels should not be seen from a public place.

Other Matters

10. There will be some environmental benefits associated with the solar panels in terms of the renewable energy that they are likely to be producing. Such matters are supported at a national level as well as within the development plan. However, the benefits are only likely be very small given the scale of the proposal and I therefore afford this matter limited weight.
11. I accept there are technical reasons which explain how the solar panels have come to be positioned in the manner in which they have at the site. This does not however provide overriding justification for the scheme and I afford this matter limited weight.
12. I do not have many details relating to the other solar panel schemes that have been brought to my attention by the appellant. In any event, it is not clear that those schemes are also within an ASLC, particularly those schemes that share the same characteristics as that before me. I therefore afford these examples limited weight.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

13. There is no indication that the decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

TJ Burnham

INSPECTOR