



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2023

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3315807

2 Halford Road, Hillingdon, Ickenham UB10 8PY

- 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 Mark McLachlan against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 56582/APP/2022/3337 dated 1 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is for the raising of roof to provide habitable accommodation within loft space, to include a double hip to gable conversion, roof lights, front and rear dormers, and erection of a two-storey side/rear extension, rear patio and external alterations to property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council changed the description of development to that in the header above. This more completely and accurately describes the development which includes alterations to the roof and therefore I have used it for my decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on: -
 - 1) the character and appearance of the area; and
 - 2) the living conditions of the occupiers of No.4 Halford Road and No.100 Long Lane.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. No.2 is a detached bungalow located at the end of Halford Road sited within a triangular-shaped plot. It is a modest property with a hipped roof and is primarily screened from the road by boundary fencing and vegetation. An attached flat roof garage and pergola structure extend up to the shared boundary with No.4; a bungalow with its side elevation running adjacent to the boundary.
5. The alterations would convert the garage and create an extension to the side and rear, which will have an angled form to align with the southern boundary. The new roof over the entire building will have an increased height and a

gabled end, significantly increasing the scale and bulk of the property, particularly at the upper level.

6. The surrounding area has a mixture of property types and several former bungalows along Halford Road have been modified and increased in size. In general, the proposed design would relate to the existing property and reflects features of other properties in the vicinity. I also accept that the appeal site is relatively generous in size and that the development would be proportionate to the plot as a whole, yet most of the space is to the front with the bungalow having a more constrained position.
7. Due to its corner location and plot alignment, separation to No.4 is already restricted. The resultant property would be slightly offset from the shared boundary, but there would be a limited visual gap between the two properties, which would have similar depths, and the proximity would be accentuated by the new roof profile.
8. This relationship would be at odds with the prevailing character which is more spacious. Additionally, the site forms part of the setting for the Ickenham Village Conservation Area (CA) with the boundary running along the appeal property's north boundary. The existing property has a neutral effect on the CA setting and is relatively inconspicuous in the street scene. In contrast, due to its juxtaposition with No.4 and together with its form and bulk, the proposal would result in a cramped and incongruous development which would be to the detriment of the character of the area.
9. The existing boundary treatment does currently screen most of the property, however, this is not a permanent feature and does not excuse development from high-quality design which responds to its context. Whilst there is two storey development to the other side, 100 Long Lane and the properties in Swakeleys Drive have a different appearance to the proposed development and the character of Halford Road which the appeal property reflects.
10. Overall, the proposed development would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area and would fail to preserve or enhance the setting of the Ickenham Village Conservation Area. Having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework the harm to the CA would be less than substantial. Nevertheless, this is still a matter of considerable importance and weight and there are no identified public benefits of the proposal which would outweigh the harm.
11. The development would therefore conflict with Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11, and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020), and Policies HC1, D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021). Together these policies support high-quality design and require development not to adversely affect the character, appearance or quality of the area, and heritage assets.

Living conditions

12. I acknowledge that a level of mutual overlooking is often found in residential areas. This proposal, however, introduces first-floor windows to an existing bungalow and the property has a small rear garden. The distance to the boundary with No.4 is limited and that property also has a relatively small area

of amenity space to the rear. Whilst the development would comply with the 45-degree line in relation to the outlook from No.4 this does not imply compliance with all aspects of amenity. The proposed dormer window would enable opportunities to directly overlook the rear garden to No.4 from an elevated position in close proximity which would result in a harmful loss of privacy to the occupiers. Accordingly, there would be conflict with policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) which amongst other things, seeks to ensure that a satisfactory relationship with adjacent properties is achieved.

13. To the other side there is more space and the separation to the semi-detached property of 100 Long Lane would be unchanged. No.100 is set further forward and whilst there would be an increase in the height and change to the profile of the side elevation, I do not find that it would be overly imposing to have an unacceptable impact on the living condition of the occupiers. There would therefore be no conflict with the identified policies in relation to the relationship with No.100.

Other Matters

14. I understand the appellant's desire to improve and increase the accommodation at No.2 and that the occupiers of the neighbouring property have not objected. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have found and the conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR