



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2021 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN MIPI

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3259470

7 Windrush Close, Ickenham UB10 8EJ

- 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 N Poulter against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 31527/APP/2020/1684, dated 18 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2020.
 - The proposed development is single storey front and side extension plus raised roof with loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. The decision notice and delegated report state that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupants of the property to the immediate west of the appeal site, No 9 Windrush Close. However, during my site visit, I saw that the property to the immediate west was No 6. This is clearly an error on the part of the Council. Where they refer to No 9 in their assessment, I believe the Council are actually referring to No 6. I provide my recommendation below on this basis.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - i) whether the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupants of No 6 Windrush Close, with particular regard to outlook; and
 - ii) the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Living Conditions

5. The appeal site accommodates a detached, L-shaped bungalow located within Windrush Close, a small residential cul-de-sac. No 6 Windrush Close lies
-

directly to the west of the appeal property. During my site visit, I saw that No 6's front-facing window nearest to the proposed front extension serves a kitchen. From the plans, it is clear that the proposal would be very visible within close-range views from this window. Much of the depth of the single-storey front extension would be readily apparent, as would much of its higher roof. Due to its close proximity, height and depth, the proposal would appear overtly obtrusive within views from No 6. The proposal would therefore cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupants of No 6 in terms of their outlook.

6. While I understand that neighbouring properties in the cul-de-sac are visible to one another due to their siting, this does not justify the proposal as its prominence in views from No 6 would be greater and so more harmful than the relationship between other dwellings in the cul-de-sac.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupants of No 6 Windrush Close, with particular regard to outlook. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 – Development Management Policies (2020) (the Local Plan Part 2), which state that development proposals should not adversely impact on the amenity of adjacent properties and that alterations to dwellings will be required to ensure that there would be no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

Character and Appearance

8. As the seven properties within the cul-de-sac have their own architectural form and style, they do not form a visually cohesive group. The appeal property and No 6 are bungalows, while the other five properties are two-storeys in height and feature catslide, hipped and pitched roof forms.
9. While the proposed extensions would significantly alter the character and original proportions of the appeal property, the larger scale of the resultant property would be more typical of properties within the cul-de-sac. Furthermore, the dormer bungalow-style design, crown roof and gables would not appear particularly incongruous when seen as part of the varied character of the immediate streetscene. Based on the submitted drawings, I am satisfied that the resultant property would have a high-quality appearance and would contribute positively to the character and appearance of the local townscape.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (2012), which states that all new development should achieve a high quality of design. The proposal would also comply with Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Local Plan Part 2, which state that all new development, including extensions, will be required to be designed to the highest standards, that development should be well integrated with the surrounding area, and that alterations to dwellings must result in no adverse cumulative impact of the proposal on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area.

Other Matters

11. While I accept that the proposal would improve an existing family home, this does not overcome the identified harm that would be caused to the living conditions of the occupants of No 6.

Planning Balance, Conclusion and Recommendation

12. While I have found that the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area, this does not outweigh the unacceptable harm caused to the living conditions of No 6 Windrush Close in terms of outlook.
13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR