



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2020

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3244436

199 Long Lane, Hillingdon, Uxbridge UB10 9JW

- 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 Peng against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 17760/APP/2019/1838, dated 31 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is first floor rear extension, alterations to main roof to provide loft conversion and formation of conservatory to rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for first floor rear extension, alterations to main roof to provide loft conversion and formation of conservatory to rear elevation at 199 Long Lane, Hillingdon, Uxbridge UB10 9JW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17760/APP/2019/1838, dated 31 May 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan; Block/Site Plan; Drawing No 199LongLane/2019/01; Drawing No 199LongLane/2019/02 Rev E; Drawing No 199LongLane/2019/03 Rev E; and 199LongLane/2019/04 Rev E.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the application form. While different to that given on the decision notice, no confirmation that a change was agreed has been provided.
3. The decision notice referred to policies from the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012) and the Council's SPD Residential Extensions. These have subsequently been withdrawn and the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (January 2020) (LPP2) have now been adopted.

Main Issue

4. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located within the Hillingdon Court Park Area of Special Local Character (ASLC). The significance of the ASLC, in part, lies in its verdant appearance centred on the park with residential properties surrounding it. The nearby properties have a varied design and mature boundary landscaping.
6. The appeal site is set back from the main road behind other properties. Although there would be two different styles of roof on the rear projection, the nearby properties and the appeal property itself already have a varied roofscape. Therefore, the proposal would not appear incongruous and the main roof would also be altered to a pitched roof. Moreover, the proposed first floor extension would break up the existing full width flat roof at ground floor level. Furthermore, the rear alterations would not be overly prominent as there is mature vegetation within the surrounding gardens and along the boundaries of the site. This largely screens the rear of the appeal property from the park and would restrict views to within nearby plots.
7. The Council have not raised concerns over other aspects of the scheme. Given the varied appearance of the nearby properties, I see no reason to reach a different finding.
8. As such, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It would accord with the design aims of Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the adopted LPP2 and Policies BE1 and HE1 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 Strategic Policies (2012).
9. Policy DMHB 5 of the LPP2 refers to the ASLCs as non-designated local heritage assets. The effect of an application on the significance of non-designated heritage assets should be taken into account according to paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework). The analysis above has done that, and my finding is that there would be no harm to or loss of any heritage asset. The appeal scheme would therefore not be contrary to Policy DMHB 5 of the LPP2 or the Framework.

Conditions

10. The standard time limit condition is imposed as well as one requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is for clarity and certainty of the scope of the permission. A further condition is imposed requiring the external materials of the scheme to match those at the existing building to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. I conclude that, for the reason given above, and taking into account all other matters raised, subject to the conditions above, the appeal should be allowed.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR