



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 September 2020

by J Hunter BA (Hons) Msc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/20/3252043

50 & 50A Willow Tree Lane, Hayes, Middlesex UB4 9BD

- 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 Mrs Rekha Aneja against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 10511/APP/2020/190, dated 31 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as single storey rear extension with loft conversion and two new front porches.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are; i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and ii) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of the appeal property and nos 48, 52 and 52A Willow Tree Lane with reference to daylight and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a modest two storey semi-detached property that is divided into two maisonettes. The surrounding area is characterised by similar properties of subtly different designs arranged in groups. The limited palette of materials, scale and fenestration design of the houses give the location a relatively uniform appearance.
4. The introduction of an additional porch and the re-ordering of the windows on the front elevation of host property, would completely unbalance the architectural composition of the pair of semis resulting in a contrived elevational design that would be at odds with the character and appearance of the pair of semis and the wider area. In this regard the proposal would be contrary to the design and character and appearance requirements of Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies 2020 (DMP).
5. The appeal proposes various roof alterations including full width rear dormer extension and alterations to the main roof that would remove the hipped

element and replace it with a gable. The dormer would be set in by 0.5 metres from the side elevations and set down 0.3 metres from the ridgeline. Nevertheless, it would occupy the vast proportion of the rear roof plain resulting in a top-heavy addition. In this regard, I consider that the proposed roof alterations would fail to comply with the requirements of Policy DMHD1 of the DMP which requires, amongst other things that roof alterations retain a substantial element of the original roof slope.

6. The proposed flat roof rear single storey extension would project 5.5 metres. It would occupy approximately one third of the rear garden and extend across almost the full width of the ground floor almost doubling the footprint of the host building. It would not therefore, be subordinate to the main dwelling nor would it accord with the maximum projection of 4 metres as set out within Policy DMHD1 of the DMP.
7. By virtue of their scale and design, the proposed combination of extensions and alterations would add considerable bulk to the host property resulting in an unbalanced and incongruous appearance, thus causing harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Living conditions

8. The proposed single storey rear extension would sit very close to the shared boundary with no 48 Willow Tree Lane and on the boundary of the shared footpath between the host property and no 52. It would also have the effect of internalising a downstairs bedroom resulting in it having one very small window opening on the eastern elevation, which by virtue of its small size, orientation and proximity to the adjacent dwelling would have an extremely poor outlook and lack of natural daylight.
9. The scale of the proposed rear extension and its close proximity to the shared boundaries would mean that the single storey extension would appear as an over dominant addition when viewed from the adjoining properties. Furthermore, due to the orientation of the properties, the extension would overshadow the ground floor windows.
10. As a consequence, the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the appeal property and nos 48, 52 and 52A Willow Tree Lane with reference to daylight and outlook. Thereby it would fail to comply with the design and living conditions requirements set out within Policies BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1- Strategic Policies (SP) 2012 and DMHB11 and DMHD1 of the DMP. These policies seek to ensure high quality design that enhances local distinctiveness and protects the living conditions of occupiers.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above and taking all other matters into account, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

J Hunter

INSPECTOR