
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 June 2022

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/22/3295676

12 Owen Road, Hayes UB4 9LB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission
 - The appeal is made by Mr Charnjeet Singh Nangpal against London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 20220/APP/2021/3603, is dated 23 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as "the erection of part single, part two storey front and side extension to improve the existing amenities of the main house located at 12 Owen Road, Hayes - UB4 9LB".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on (i) the living conditions of the occupiers of 13 Owen Road with regards to outlook and light; and (ii) the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

Living conditions

3. The proposal would introduce an expanse of built development within close proximity to the side elevation of 13 Owen Road (No 13) which contains a first floor window. Due to its scale and positioning, the proposal would be a dominating structure that would severely compromise outlook from the first floor side window of No 13 that would be to the detriment of the occupiers living conditions.
4. A daylight and sunlight assessment has been submitted, including shadow and lighting analysis diagrams. This assessment appears to indicate that the proposal would not overshadow the first floor side window of No 13 however, there is insufficient evidence in terms of how the proposal would effect the amount of natural light into this first floor room of No 13. Given the close proximity of the proposal to the first floor side window of No 13 and the proposals massing, it would have an overbearing effect that would reduce the amount of natural light received into the first floor side window of No 13.
5. Accordingly, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 13 with regards to outlook and light. The proposal would be contrary to Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies which seeks development to protect

the amenity of surrounding buildings and ensure there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

Character and appearance

6. The area surrounding the appeal site is characterised predominantly by residential properties with simple architectural design and detailing. The properties along Owen Road in this location are uniformed and linear in style with minimal gaps between the properties. It is this tight knit linear form of development which contributes to the character of the area.
7. The proposed extensions would significantly increase the size of the appeal property however, given the design of the extensions, the development would provide a simple uniformed property that would blend in well with the existing built form of the street. Whilst the side extensions would result in the closing of gaps between neighbouring properties either side, this would be in keeping with the close knit form of the surrounding buildings.
8. Due to the design, scale and massing of the proposed extensions, they would be subordinate additions that would not appear overly dominant or a cramped form of development. The architectural integrity of the appeal building and the surrounding street scene would not be adversely compromised. The character and appearance of the appeal property and surrounding area would not be harmed as a result of the proposed development.

Other Matters

9. I have had regard to the appellants statement of case including lack of communication from the Council and contradicting information from Council Officers. Whilst frustration on these matters would be understandable, they do not alter my findings on the planning matters above and the harm which I have identified with regards to living conditions on neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would not have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area. However, this matter would not outweigh the harm I have identified with regards to the effects on the living conditions of occupiers of No 13 with regards to outlook and light.
11. 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.
12. Therefore, for the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR