



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2024

**by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 4 November 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3349115**

**21 Thornhill Road, Ickenham, Hillingdon UB10 8SG**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Steve Evans against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref is 5192/APP/2024/445.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a first floor extension to create a 2 storey dwelling house and associated alterations.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. It is considered that the main issues are the effects of the proposed development on (a) the character and appearance of the streetscene and (b) the living conditions of 17 Thornhill Road.

### Reasons

#### *Character and Appearance*

3. The appeal property is a detached single storey dwelling situated within a residential area comprising a mix of detached bungalows and houses. These properties are generally set back from the footways to the rear of front gardens that are landscaped and used for parking. The design of the properties fronting the road vary with no consistency, particularly where dwellings have been altered or extended. Also along the road, there are examples of 2-storey dwellings being sited adjacent to bungalows.
4. Reference is made in the Planning Officer's report to a previously dismissed appeal which included raising the ridge height of the property (Ref APP/R5510/D/20/3258934). However, the full details of this previous proposal have not been provided and, as such, this appeal has been assessed on its own planning circumstances. The same approach has been adopted in the context of the various other schemes within the surrounding area which have been identified by the appellant.
5. The proposed development includes a first floor extension which would result in the bungalow becoming a 2-storey dwelling and, as a consequence, the character and appearance of the host property would be significantly altered.

The proposed development would not, as the council has identified, be subordinate in scale and massing to the size of the host property. Further, the roof would be raised above the existing ridgeline of the property which is not supported by Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (HLP2).

6. However, the design and appearance of the property is not of any particular architectural merit and nor does it make a significant contribution to the character of streetscene. The proposed development would result in the erection of a 2-storey dwelling rather than just be an extension to the existing property.
7. The resulting 2-storey property would reflect the design and appearance of some of the dwellings fronting Thornhill Road, including possessing a hipped roof, a 2-storey front gable projection and an enclosed porch. The siting of the proposed 2 storey dwelling next to a bungalow would reflect other similar relationships along the road. The resulting 2-storey property would fit into the character and appearance of the streetscene rather than be a conspicuous or incongruous form of development. The appeal scheme would not conflict with HLP2 Policy DMHB 12 which requires development to be well integrated with the surrounding area.
8. As identified in the Planning Officer's report, the higher flank wall of the property would be visible from the road. However, there are other 2-storey side elevations of a similar size and depth also visible when walking along the road where the gaps between the dwelling permit. These include the flank walls of Nos. 23 and 25 which are sited close to the access drive serving No. 23A. The architectural composition of the resulting property would not conflict with HLP2 Policy DMHB 11 and would be of a high quality of design sought by Policy BE 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (HLP1).
9. On this issue, it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene and, as such, it would not conflict with HLP1 Policy B1 and HLP2 Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1.

#### *Living Conditions*

10. As part of the appeal, the appellant submitted a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment which assesses the effects of the proposed development on the levels of sunlight and daylight reaching the habitable room windows of Nos. 17 and 23. This Assessment concludes that there would be no unacceptable overshadowing or loss of day and sun light to the windows of habitable rooms the neighbouring properties. This includes the habitable room window situated within the front elevation of No. 17 which would be sited closest to the proposed 2-storey front projection.
11. The outlook from the nearest habitable room window of No. 17 is currently towards the front garden. By reason of the close relationship between the siting of No. 17 and the appeal property, within this outlook is the single storey flank wall of the property. The hipped roof form of the property means that the roof slopes away from the shared boundary rather than the outlook from the window being visually dominated by the side elevation of the property.
12. However, the proposed development would result in a 2-storey flank wall being erected close to the shared boundary between the property and No. 17. By

reason of the nearest habitable room window of No. 17 being sited rearwards of the appeal property, the outlook from this opening would be visually dominated by the proposed siting and bulk of a 2-storey flank wall of the resulting dwelling. Although there would be no harm associated with loss of daylight, sunlight and overshadowing, these matters are demonstrably outweighed by the unacceptable harm associated with the loss of outlook for the occupiers of this neighbouring property.

13. For the reasons given, the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of 17 Thornhill Road and, as such, it would conflict with HLP2 Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 which require development not to adversely impact on the amenity of adjacent properties, including there being no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

### **Conclusion**

14. Although the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene, this matter is demonstrably outweighed by the significant harm which would be caused to the living conditions of the occupiers of 17 Thornhill Road. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

*D J Barnes*

INSPECTOR