



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2020

by William Cooper BA (Hons) MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/20/3250338 30 Green Lane, Uxbridge UB8 3ED

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Adi Nandal against the decision of Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref: 68545/APP/2019/3912 is dated 2 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey side infill extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include, 2 side dormers, 5 roof lights and raised roof over rear extension and overall raising ridge height.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the appeal form as it is more precise than that shown on the application form.
3. The Council did not issue a decision within the prescribed period or within an agreed extension of time period. The appellant exercised their right to appeal against the failure of the Council, as the local planning authority, to determine the application.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the area including the host building, and
 - the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to outlook and loss of light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The site comprises a detached bungalow and its garden space. It is located in a mainly residential area.
6. The appeal property is situated on the southern part of Green Lane, south of Haig Lane. It is on a stretch of street between Nos 17 and 18 Green Lane. This stretch is mainly characterised by rows of detached bungalows. On this part of Green Lane, the bungalows are predominantly set out in an alternating

- sequence of gable-roofed and hip-roofed bungalows. The gable-roofed bungalows on the western side of the street, including the appeal building, are typically set forward of the hip-roofed neighbouring bungalows.
7. Several bungalows on Green Lane have dormers, including a noticeably substantial pair at No 23 which is approximately located opposite the appeal site. The appellant considers that such 'bulky and top-heavy dwellings' have 'harmonised with the setting'. However, absence of dormers is a predominant characteristic of the host row and in its vicinity.
 8. As such, the 'embattled' line of alternating gable-roofed and hip-roofed bungalows, and absence of dormers from the majority are key contributors to the architectural rhythm of the row and the character of the southern part of Green Lane.
 9. The side gaps between bungalows on the western side of the street are typically of modest width at around 2m. This, and the position of the host building further forward of neighbouring bungalows, contribute to the architectural sensitivities of the setting.
 10. The proposed additions would entail an increase in the building's bulk and mass. The ridge height of the main body of the building would increase by around 0.6m, with associated steepening of its roof pitch. Dormer 'ears' would be added on both sides of the roof. The roof over the rear extension would be raised from single-storey flat roof level around 3m high to a pitched roof ridge height of approximately 5.4m. The rear part of the building would consequently change from a subordinate extension to an expansion of the increased bulk of the main part of the building.
 11. Together the proposed increased building bulk, mass and height would overwhelm the bungalow's original scale and form. Furthermore, it would jarringly disrupt the architectural rhythm and proportionality of the host row. Within its setting, this would have a discordant impact on the existing building and the streetscene. Given the orientation of the building gable-on towards the street, and its comparatively forward position, the above effects would be noticeable from various viewpoints on Green Lane and neighbouring properties.
 12. Given the above totality of impact, the proposed use of materials to match the existing building would not acceptably assimilate the development within its setting.
 13. Therefore the proposal would not accord with part A) i) of Policy DMHB11 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) (DMP), which requires development to harmonise with local context. The proposal would conflict with Policy DMHD1 of the DMP which requires roof extensions to be subservient to the scale of the existing roof, within a context of generally not supporting raising of the roof ridgeline, in order to avoid disproportionate additions. The proposal would also be contrary to distinctiveness and context criteria 1 and 2 of Policy BE1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 Strategic Policies (2012) (SP).
 14. In conclusion, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the building, the streetscene and the area. As such, it would conflict with Policy BE1 of the SP and Policies DMHB11 and DMHD1 of the DMP, which together seek to ensure that development complements local character.

Living conditions of neighbouring occupiers

15. The proposal would entail an increase in the bulk of the upper part of the appeal building, which adjoins the side boundary of No 32 and has an approximately 2m wide separation gap to the bungalow at No 28 Green Lane. The proximity and discordant nature of the effects identified above would have an overbearing effect on outlook from the kitchen of No 32 and the gardens of these neighbouring properties.
16. Given the location of the appeal building to the north of No 32 Green Lane, the proposal would not significantly shade the latter from sunlight. However, given the modest separation gap between the neighbouring buildings, the proposed increase in roof and dormer bulk would reduce daylight to the kitchen of No 32.
17. Given the appeal building's proximity to, and location to the south of No 28 the proposed development would reduce receivable daylight, and afternoon and evening sunlight to the latter property.
18. In conclusion, the proposal would harm the living conditions of occupiers of Nos 28 and 32 Green Lane with regard to daylight, and of No 28 with regard to loss of sunlight and overshadowing. It would also harm outlook from these neighbouring properties. As such the proposal would conflict with Policy BE1 of the SP and Policies DMHB11 and DMHD1 of the DMP, which together seek to ensure that development safeguards the living conditions of residents.

Other Matters

19. The proposed development would provide additional living space within the property. However, the benefit would be limited by the scale of development and would not outweigh the identified harm.

Conclusion

20. The proposal would be contrary to the development plan and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. Accordingly, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

William Cooper

INSPECTOR