The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 11 October 2021

by Martin Chandler BSc, MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3283422
134 Long Lane, Hillingdon, Uxbridge UB10 0EH

- 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 Sarabdeep Lotay against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 74860/APP/2021/2082, dated 23 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 July 2021.
- The development proposed is Part two storey, part single storey side and rear extension and porch to front.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions for the occupants of 136 Long Lane (No 136).

Reasons

3. Based on the evidence before me, the appeal site has a detailed planning history with numerous planning applications both refused and approved, as well as a dismissed appeal. However, I have been provided with very little information regarding these matters and therefore the weight I can attribute to the planning history is somewhat limited.

4. Despite this, it has been brought to my attention that the rear projecting ground floor element of the proposal would be identical to two recently approved planning applications[1]. Based on the evidence before me, I have no reason to dispute this matter. Accordingly, I am satisfied that this element of the proposal would be an appropriate addition to the existing dwelling. I also note that the Council raise no specific objections in relation to the ground floor element of the proposal to the side of the dwelling that would abut the shared boundary with No 136. Again, I have no reason to disagree with the analysis on this point.

5. Nevertheless, the Council's concerns manifest themselves in the first floor element of the proposal. This would be set back from the front of the house by one metre and would be set one metre away from the shared side boundary. It would also span the full depth of the existing dwelling, projecting 3.6 metres beyond the existing rear elevation at first floor level. Accordingly, it would

[1] 74680/APP/2020/2168 and 74860/APP/2020/3702

introduce a substantial level of additional bulk to the rear of the existing property.

6. Due to its location on a service road off the principal highway, the existing dwelling is set beyond No 136. Accordingly, much of its existing bulk and mass already projects beyond the footprint of the neighbouring property, including its own rear extension. As identified above, the proposal would substantially increase the bulk and mass of the existing building. In doing this, although the first floor bulk would be set off the boundary by one metre, the extent of building mass that would project beyond No 136 would significantly and demonstrably increase. As a consequence, due to the location of the existing building, and the depth and height of the proposal, the extension would appear as a large and intrusive structure when viewed from the neighbouring property. It would substantially dominate its outlook, and accordingly, in my judgement, it would become an overbearing and oppressive extension.

7. I note the appellant's comments in relation to a previously refused application[2] and the suggestion that the first-floor element of this proposal is identical and was deemed to be acceptable by the Council. However, I do not have the details of this proposal before me, and although I note the potential ambiguity of the Council's refusal reason for that application, I have to judge this proposal on the basis of the evidence before me. On that basis, the proposal would represent an intrusive and dominant addition when viewed from No 136.

8. Consequently, for the reasons identified above, the proposal would harm the living conditions for the occupants of No 136. It would therefore fail to comply with Policies DMHB11 and DMHD1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies (2020), which taken together seek amongst other things, extensions which provide a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings.

Conclusion

9. The appeal is dismissed.

Martin Chandler

INSPECTOR

[2] 74860/APP/2021/1120