



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 August 2023

by H Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/23/3318855

14 Larne Road, Hillingdon, Ruislip HA4 8DR

- 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 Dariusz Urlewicz against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 57311/APP/2022/3104, dated 10 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 23 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is demolition of an existing 2-bed bungalow and building a new 4-bedroom bungalow with a habitable roof space, including side dormer, raising the ridge of the main roof, roof lights and solar panels.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. In their appeal statement the Council conceded reasons for refusal 2 and 3 as they had misinterpreted the plans. The proposed room in the roof space would be a bathroom and the facing dormer on No 16 Larne Road (No 16) also serves a shower room, not a habitable room. Based on this evidence I agree that there would be no harm to the living conditions of the occupants of No 16 or future occupiers of appeal property.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a 2 bedroom bungalow in a residential area characterised by bungalows of various designs. They are set back a similar distance from the road behind low walls giving a defined building line and giving a regular rhythm to the street.
5. The proposal would be taller than the dwelling it would replace, as well as introducing an angled front wall and black timber cladding to the front and rear elevations.
6. The proposed angled front elevation would not reflect the symmetrical appearance of dwellings in Larne Road. Whilst the existing dwellings in the street are of varying designs and there are examples of bay windows within the streetscene, the set back to part of the roof and the angled first floor window would create a prominent feature that would appear noticeably at odds with

the features of properties nearby, disrupting the regular rhythm of the street and appearing incongruous in the street scene.

7. There may be an historical association with the use of black timber cladding in the area and my attention has been drawn to examples of its use on dwellings in the vicinity of the proposal. On Eastcote Road I saw dwellings that had timber cladding to the gable, in a triangle shape. This proposal would include the cladding to much of the front elevation which would give a different appearance than those I saw and a larger expanse of cladding. In addition, I did not see any examples of black timber cladding on the dwellings on Larne Road, although some had a small amount of black detailing on a predominantly white elevation. In any event, I have determined this appeal on the site-specific circumstances of this case.
8. For the reasons given, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021), Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One- Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) which together, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development achieves a high quality of design and harmonises with the local context. It would also conflict with the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

9. Whilst I note the support from neighbouring occupiers, this would not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area I have identified.
10. I acknowledge the appellants willingness to accept design amendments to the scheme, as reflected in the more recently approved planning application. However, I have determined this appeal on the basis of the plans submitted with the planning application, on which the Council made its decision.
11. I note the appellant's concerns regarding the Council's handling of the case. However, this is a matter that would need to be taken up with the Council in the first instance. In determining this appeal, I am only able to have regard to the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion

12. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, that outweigh this conflict. I therefore conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

H Senior

INSPECTOR