



---

## Appeal Decision

by J Heppell BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 January 2026

---

### Appeal Ref: 6001294

### 106 The Larches, Uxbridge, Hillingdon UB10 0DW

- 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 Neushloss against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref is 65903/APP/2025/1746.
  - The development proposed is first-floor side extension and the conversion from a single dwelling house into two self-contained flats.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matter

2. The existing drawings show that the property has 5 bedrooms. However, it is clear that one of the bedrooms in the loft area has been incorrectly labelled as such. The layout of this small room appears to be washroom. I have assessed the proposal as such.

### Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are:
  - the effect of the proposal on the supply of larger houses in Hillingdon;
  - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area; and
  - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 108 The Larches (No 108) with particular reference to outlook and light.

### Reasons

#### *Supply of larger houses*

4. The policy context for the supply of family homes is set by Policy H10 of the London Plan March 2021 (LP) and Policy DMH 2 of the Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies Adopted Version, 16 January 2020 (LPP2). Together these policies require the mix of housing units in residential schemes to reflect current local housing need. In respect of Hillingdon, the supporting text to Policy DMH 2 advises that there is a substantial borough-wide requirement for larger units, particularly three bedroom properties.

5. The existing dwelling has four bedrooms and is therefore a larger unit for the purposes of LPP2 Policy DMH 2, which identifies three bedroom properties as larger units. The proposal would result in two 2 bedroom flats being created which, whilst creating an additional residential unit which would be well designed, and supporting the objectives of LP Policy H2 to deliver new homes on small sites below 0.25 hectares, would result in the loss of a larger unit for which there is an identified need as set out within the LPP2. No evidence has been provided to demonstrate that this need for larger dwellings has been addressed or that the proposal would meet an identified local need, and the proposal would consequently fail to reflect local housing need.
6. I conclude that the proposal would reduce the supply of larger houses in Hillingdon, contrary to Policy H10 of the LP and Policy DMH 2 of the LPP2, the aims of which I have outlined above. There would be no conflict with Policy DMH 1 of the LPP2, which is referred to in the Council's decision notice, because the proposal would create two self-contained flats with a combined floorspace comparable to that of the existing dwelling, thereby providing equivalent residential floorspace.
7. The Council's Report states that by occupying two floors, the proposed upper floor flat would breach Policy DMH 4 of the LPP2. However, as no more than one unit per floor is proposed, the proposal would satisfy the policy. Furthermore, the floor area of the original building to be converted (i.e. the dwelling as extended) exceeds 120sqm, as required by Policy DMH 4. There would therefore be no conflict with Policy DMH 4.

#### *Character and appearance*

8. The surrounding area is characterised by semi-detached and terraced houses under pitched roofs. Flat roofed single storey side additions are also characteristic of the area. The appeal property is an end terrace dwelling, and consequently there is a gap between it and the adjacent house, No 108. Notwithstanding the existence of a single storey flat-roofed side addition on the host property, and the fact that the hipped roof on the host property has been extended to form a gable, there is a clear visual gap between it and the adjacent dwelling.
9. By adding a first floor above the existing side projection, close to the boundary with the adjacent house, the proposal would appreciably reduce the visual separation between the two houses. This would be to the detriment of the appearance of the street, where the gaps between properties are generally unobstructed at first floor level. Moreover, the proposed flat roof would be out of character with the appearance of the host dwelling and the locality, introducing an alien roof form at first floor level which would not be sympathetic to the surrounding built environment since, except at ground floor, pitched roofs predominate in the immediate area.
10. The appellant has referred to other extensions in The Larches, but has not been specific as to where they are. My observations were that flat roofs were generally confined to the single storey additions to which I have alluded, and it has not been demonstrated that two storey flat roof extensions are a characteristic of the immediate area.
11. By virtue of having a lower roof than the host property and being slightly set back, the proposal would remain subordinate to the host dwelling. The proposal would

have only a moderate impact on the symmetry of the terrace, because the terrace is sufficiently long that its two ends are not generally appreciated in the same views. I furthermore note that the proposed fenestration and materials would match the existing. However, none of these factors outweighs the harm I have identified.

12. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area, contrary to Policy D3 of the LP, Policy BE1 of the Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies (Adopted November 2012) (LPP1) and policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the LPP2. Together these policies require development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment and to be appropriate to the identity and context of buildings, and for two storey side extensions to take into account gaps between structures and to be a minimum of 1m from the side boundary.

### *Living conditions*

13. The side elevation of the adjacent property, No 108, contains two windows on the ground floor, which I am advised are a hallway window and secondary kitchen window, along with a door. Whilst the hallway window is offset from the side addition on the host property, the kitchen window and the door face directly towards it. At first floor there is a secondary window which faces the two storey side elevation of the host property.
14. The outlook from the kitchen window and the door is currently limited given the presence of the side addition on the host property. There are however views of the sky from these openings, which would be harmfully eroded by the proposed extension, given its height and proximity to the side elevation of No 108. In terms of the first floor window, the proposal would result in a solid wall noticeably closer to it than the existing situation. This would be oppressive and overbearing to occupiers of No 108, harmfully eroding outlook and light.
15. I have had regard to the plan included in the appellant's Appeal Statement showing that the side addition already breaches a 45 degree line taken from the ground floor openings, and that the roof of the host property likewise breaches a 45 degree line taken from the first floor window. However, this evidence does not alter my finding that the proposal would worsen the outlook from these openings. Moreover, I have not been provided with a daylight and sunlight assessment to demonstrate that suitable living conditions would be retained in the affected rooms.
16. The proposal would extend rearwards behind the rear elevation of No 108. There is disagreement between the parties about whether it would breach a 45 degree line measured from No 108's nearest rear-facing windows, but irrespective of this, a first floor extension located so close to the boundary would have an overbearing effect on the outlook from the rear of No 108.
17. I conclude that the proposal would harm the living conditions of No 108 with particular reference to outlook and light, contrary to Policy D3 of the LP and Policy DMHB 11 of the LPP2. Together these policies require development to deliver an appropriate outlook and to avoid adversely impacting on the daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties. The proposal would conflict with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework by failing to provide a high standard of amenity for existing users. I have not found the proposal to be in conflict with Policy DHMB 16 of the LPP2, which deals with internal space standards.

## **Planning Balance**

18. The proposal would provide an additional dwelling as well as providing smaller dwellings for which there is a need, in accordance with Policy H2 of the LP. It would support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of new homes. I attach moderate weight to these benefits given the quantum of development. The use of matching materials, refuse and cycle storage, and adherence to a construction management plan are requirements of well-designed development, and neither weigh in favour or against the proposal.
19. The proposal would result in the loss of a larger unit suitable for a family, for which there is an identified housing need. Harm would also be caused to the character and appearance of the area and to the living conditions of nearby occupiers, in conflict with the development plan. These are matters to which I give significant weight.
20. Consequently, whilst the proposal offers a number of benefits, they are not sufficient to outweigh the policy conflict and other harms I have identified.

## **Conclusion**

21. For the above reasons, the proposal conflicts with the development plan, when read as a whole. Material considerations do not indicate that a decision should be taken other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*J Heppell*

INSPECTOR