
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2020

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3250498

31 Manor Lane, Hayes UB3 5EG

- 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 & Mrs Preet Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 74228/APP/2019/1213, dated 18 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is conversion of roofspace to habitable use involving raising of ridge height and a front and rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the Council's description of the development in reaching my decision as it more fully describes the details of the development than that given on the original planning application form. The appellant's appeal form also makes reference to the updated description.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area, having particular regard to the setting of adjacent Harlington Village Conservation Area and Grade II listed buildings at Nos 268-272 High Street.

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises of a detached bungalow located within a mature well-established residential area, characterised by single storey and two storey properties of varying style and designs set back from the road.
5. It is situated adjacent to the Harlington Village Conservation Area (CA) and Grade II listed buildings at Nos 268-272 High Street to the east and the Green Belt to the west of the appeal site. These contribute to the mature well-established residential character and appearance of the area, that is further enhanced by the presence of mature landscaping and established trees within the surrounding gardens and open Green Belt land.
6. The proposal would involve the raising and enlargement of the hipped roof and the conversion of the loft space to create additional accommodation. The loft

conversion would involve the construction of a small flat roof dormer on the front roof slope and a larger flat roof dormer on the rear roof slope. The dormers would be located centrally within the roof planes, stepped down below the ridge level and set up above the eaves.

7. Although raising the roof by about 0.9m would extend the overall height of the property, the degree of upward projection would not appear excessive and would result in a comparable ridge height to the adjacent dormer bungalow at No. 29 Manor Lane. The scale and form of the rear dormer would nevertheless still result in a significant addition relative to the main property. As such, although set back and stepped down, the proposed rear dormer, combined with the enlarged hipped roof, would result in substantial bulk being added over the main dwelling that would be out of character with the more modest form and appearance of the host building.
8. These shortcomings would be exacerbated by the proposal's position, which would be visible from a number of public vantage points along Manor Lane. The proposed rear dormer, by virtue of its scale, siting and design, combined with the enlarged roof, would fail to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property. As such, I consider that the proposed development would result in incongruous and out-of-keeping additions that would cause unacceptable harm to the host property and the area.
9. I have considered the appellants arguments that the design and layout of the proposed roof extensions has been carefully considered and redesigned in response to the previously dismissed scheme at the property¹ and the Council's comments during the planning application process. Whilst the use of matching materials, fenestrations and hipped roof design would assist in integrating the proposed roof extensions with the host property, these aspects do not overcome the adverse effects outlined above. As such, I consider that the development would adversely harm rather than positively contribute to the character and appearance of the host property and the area.
10. Given the location of the appeal site adjacent to the Grade II listed buildings at Nos 268-272 High Street and the CA, special attention must be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the setting of the listed buildings and the character or appearance of the CA. The historic and architectural significance of the white painted listed buildings with their timber framed sash windows and old tiled pitched roofs can be appreciated from both outside as well as within the site.
11. Although it would be set back from the adjacent listed buildings and the CA, I consider that the proposed rear dormer, combined with the enlarged roof, would introduce a dominant feature on the roof plane of the host property that would fail to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the adjacent listed property. In that context the proposal would be unacceptably dominant and out of character, having a negative material impact on the setting and, thereby, harming the significance of the adjacent listed buildings and CA. The setting of the listed buildings and CA would therefore not be preserved.
12. Given the modest scale of the development, the harm would be less than substantial but in accordance with paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework, that harm should be weighed against any public benefits to

¹ 74228/APP/2018/3580

the proposal. I note the appellants desire is to provide additional living accommodation within the host property and secure its optimum viable use. However, I find insufficient public benefit arising from this proposal to offset the identified harm to which I attach significant weight.

13. Consequently, I conclude that the development would adversely harm the character and appearance of the host building and the area, including the setting of the adjacent CA and listed buildings. It would conflict with the overall design and conservation aims of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies 2012 and Policies DMHB1, DMHB2, DMHB4, DMHB11 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies 2020. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development proposals for extensions or alterations of buildings will be of a high standard of design in relation to the property to be extended and the character of the surrounding area; and preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation areas and the setting of heritage assets.

Other Matters

14. I have noted the other developments in the area drawn to my attention by the appellants. However, the roof extensions and various alterations at No. 29 Manor Lane have different development characteristics and were built in a different policy context. The dwelling at No. 27A Manor Lane and the roof extensions at Nos. 43, 47 and 49 Manor Lane are of a different scale and form to the appeal scheme. In any event, each proposal falls to be assessed primarily on its own merits and I am unaware of the full circumstances associated with these developments.
15. I have noted the comments received from third parties, including the petition of support for the proposal. However, in light of my findings on the main issues of the appeal, my decision does not turn on these matters.
16. I note the appellants comments regarding the various benefits arising from the proposal including the scheme's high quality design and providing additional accommodation to meet the appellants needs. While I have given them some weight, these benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified. For all these reasons, there are no other material considerations to outweigh the development plan conflicts identified.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR