



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2021 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 April 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3265171

73 Long Lane, Hillingdon, Uxbridge, UB10 0AN

- 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 B. Savage against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 10856/APP/2020/1986, dated 30 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 October 2020.
 - The development is a two-storey side extension, single storey side/rear extension, conservatory to side, conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer, 2 front rooflights, conversion of roof from hip to gable end, installation of basement level, porch to front and single storey outbuilding to front/side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension, single storey side/rear extension, conservatory to side, conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer, 2 front rooflights, conversion of roof from hip to gable end, installation of basement level, porch to front and single storey outbuilding to front/side at 73 Long Lane, Hillingdon, Uxbridge, UB10 0AN, in accordance with the terms of application Ref 10856/APP/2020/1986, dated 30 June 2020 and approved plans nos. AAL-19-199-P01, AAL-19-199-P02 Rev A and AAL-19-199-P04.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. The application is submitted retrospectively and during the site visit I observed that the works were completed. Accordingly, I have considered the proposal on this basis.
4. In the interest of accuracy, the description of development in the header above is based on the Council's decision notice.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.
-

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on a corner plot on the western side of Long Lane at the junction with Charnwood Road. It lies within an established residential area characterised by a mix of semi-detached and terraced housing. There is a tall and mature tree located in the northern corner of the plot on the boundary with No.1 Charnwood Road. Coupled with landscaping along the flank of the garden shed, it offers a significant degree of screening to the appeal site.
7. The width and bulk of the two-storey side extension does not appear excessive and has not adversely altered the appearance of the building as a whole. It is set-back from the main front elevation, and down from the ridge, and so appears subservient to the host dwelling. The resultant roof profile, despite being a gable end design, adequately harmonises with the host dwelling given the two-storey side extension has a pitched roof which mirrors the neighbouring property. I therefore find that the alteration of the original roof profile is mitigated by the double-storey side extension which preserves a pitched roof element thus maintaining a degree of symmetry and balance across the pair of semi-detached houses of which the appeal property forms part. To the rear, the roof dormer has a typical design, does not look bulky or excessive and thus does not adversely impact the appearance of the property. The use of white render and matching materials also serves to create a unified design in keeping with the host dwelling. In my view, therefore, the rhythm of the built form along the street has not been eroded.
8. Furthermore, the single storey rear extension is appropriately scaled and whilst the triangular infill section is unconventional I do not find, in this instance, that it has an adverse impact on the appearance of the dwelling. The single storey side extension is also not excessively sized and appears as a conventional conservatory. It has a modest height and given its lightweight structure, extensive fenestration, and glazed roof, it does not have a dominant effect on the host dwelling. Similarly, the outbuilding maintains a discreet profile with a flat roof and an attractive timber finish. Its scale is proportional to the plot and it lies behind tall mature trees which provide effective screening.
9. The prevailing character of No. 73 and the surrounding context have been preserved owing to the fact that the outbuilding and extensions do not feature prominently in the street scene and respect the property's defining architectural form. I therefore find the development as a whole is compatible with the existing building and has not resulted in bulky and visually discordant features that harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Also, the Council raise no objection to the basement and I have no reason to consider otherwise.
10. Given the above, the development therefore does not conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies document and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (the 'Local Plan: Part 2') which together aim to ensure that alterations and extensions are well-designed, appear subordinate to the main dwelling and harmonise with the local context. The development also adheres to policy DMHD2 of the Local Plan: Part 2 which seeks to ensure residential outbuildings are constructed to a high standard of design and are

proportionate to the footprint of the dwelling house and to the residential curtilage in which they stand.

11. I do not find that policy DMHB 12 of the Local Plan: Part 2, quoted in the decision notice, is directly relevant to the proposal as it relates more specifically to public realm developments, pedestrian legibility and green infrastructure.
12. Overall, the development accords with the development plan as a whole.

Conditions

13. The Council has suggested a number of conditions that it would wish to see imposed in the event that the appeal was successful. I have considered the suggested conditions against the advice on conditions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.
14. I have identified the approved plans within the terms of the decision in order to provide certainty. As the development has already been built I have not imposed the standard condition relating to the commencement of development. For the same reason I have also not included a condition requiring the external materials match the existing building.

Recommendation

15. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR