



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2019

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3234564

55 Hughes Road, Hayes UB3 3AP

- 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 Gurvinder Toor against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 61119/APP/2019/1589, dated 12 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as "Conversion of existing bungalow to two-storey including extensions to front and rear with loft dormer. Addition of single-storey side garage. Retention of existing single-storey side extension with roof alterations."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of the appeal property, 53 Hughes Road (No 53) and 46 Hamilton Road (No 46) with regards to outlook, light, privacy and amenity space.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The surrounding area is characterised predominantly by residential properties with traditional architectural detailing. The majority of the properties in the area are two storey semi-detached with hipped style roofs. The appeal property is a bungalow with a hipped style roof that is set back and orientated differently from other properties in the area. Given its corner location and design, the appeal property is prominent and positively contributes to the character of the area.
4. The proposals would introduce a roof form with gable ends that would be out of keeping with the mainly hipped roof style in the area. Whilst the proposed roof would retain symmetry and not be much higher than other dwellings in the area, its gable end design would be an incongruous feature that would appear intrusive within the surrounding area.
5. The proposed dormer windows on the main roof and side extension, including the link section between the window sections on the main roof, would be bulky additions. The dormers would be set in from the eaves, ridge and sides of the

roof however, given the overall size they would dominate the rear roof elevations and not appear subordinate to the dwelling. They would be predominantly screened from the front street scene however, they would be visible from the gardens of neighbouring properties and appear excessively large. I note that there are other dormer window additions on neighbouring properties and the appellant has indicated that most of these were undertaken by permitted development. Nevertheless, these other dormers do not alter my findings with regards to the proposed dormers which would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area due to the scale and design.

6. The proposed side extension, due to its size and flat roof design would be at odds with the overall style of the dwelling. I note that the proposed width of the extension would not be significant and there would be reasonable gaps between the appeal property and the neighbouring properties either side. The side extension however, would not be subservient given its flat roof design and overall size and would result in a discordant feature that would detract from the appearance of the surrounding area.
7. The surrounding area has a mix of different boundary treatments to the front of the properties. The proposed boundary wall and railings are sensitive in design and height and would not appear overly bulky. The railings to the upper section of the proposed boundary treatment would maintain the open aspect of the area. The proposed boundary treatment would not appear intrusive and would not be out of keeping with the varied style of boundary treatment in the area. Whilst I have found the proposed boundary treatment to be acceptable this does not outweigh the harm I have identified above with regards to the proposed roof, dormer windows and side extension.
8. The proposed roof, dormer windows and side extension would be incongruous features that would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposals would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies 2012, Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 – Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies 2012 (UDP), the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions 2008 (SPGRE) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment, harmonise with the existing street scene and the original building, and complements the character of the area.
9. I have had regard to the appellants statement of case which indicates that the existing bungalow does not make efficient use of the site, the two storey part of the property would be set back and retains open space, the front and rear extension and the alterations to the front elevation would represent good design, and that there is no objection to an additional floor being created. These matters however, would not outweigh the harm I have identified above with regards to the character and appearance of the area.

Living conditions

10. The proposed development would be large and in close proximity to the neighbouring properties of Nos 53 and 46. There are windows in the side elevation of No 53 which overlook the appeal site. The current outlook from these windows is onto a modest bungalow. The proposal would be significantly higher than the existing arrangement and would create a dominant expanse of

built development when viewed from the side windows of No 53. It is noted that the side dormer window of No 53 is within the roof of the property, nevertheless the outlook from the ground and first floor windows would be detrimentally affected by the overbearing presence of the proposals.

11. The appellant has indicated that the existing property is poorly configured and the proposal is designed to accommodate a family of 8 individuals. Outdoor space is important to meet the demands of everyday life for occupants, providing an area for relaxation as well as essential activities. The proposed rear amenity area would be small being around 70 square metres (sqm) in area and would not be sufficient to accommodate a family of 8 individuals. I note that the property has side gardens however, they would be overlooked, even with the proposed boundary treatment and would not provide private amenity areas. The shape of the appeal site does dictate the garden area and I appreciate that the appellant is satisfied with the proposed rear garden size. I also note that the appellant indicates that the recommendation in the SPGRE for garden sizes is only guidance. The proposed rear garden area however would be a small area in comparison to the large proposed development. The lack of suitable outdoor private amenity space would give the property an oppressive feel that would have a detrimental effect on the living conditions of the occupants of the property.
12. The properties in the area are developed in a tight knit form and there is existing overlooking from properties into neighbouring gardens. The proposed development would create a similar arrangement of overlooking. Given the location of the proposed windows and the distance to the site boundary, I am satisfied that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the living conditions of Nos 53 and 46 in terms of overlooking and privacy. The location of the proposed development and the orientation of the properties in the area would ensure that the proposal would not create any adverse effects in terms of loss of light to neighbouring occupiers. Whilst the proposal would not have a detrimental effect in terms of overlooking, privacy or light, this would not outweigh the harmful effects created by the proposal with regards to outlook and amenity space.
13. The proposed development would have a harmful effect on the living conditions on the occupiers of the appeal property and No 53 with regards to outlook and amenity space. The proposal would not be in accordance with Policies BE19, BE21 and BE23 of the UDP, the SPGRE, the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document Residential Layouts 2006 and the Framework which, amongst other things, seeks development not to result in a significant loss of residential amenity and maintain external amenity space which is sufficient to protect the amenity of the occupants.

Conclusion

14. I conclude that for the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR