



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 August 2022

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3297830

8 Hamlin Crescent, Eastcote, Pinner HA5 2SU

- 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 Ms Narshi Bala against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 10449/APP/2021/4170, dated 11 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as the "Construction of an additional floor to convert the existing bungalow into a two storey dwelling; single storey side and rear extensions (following partial demolition of single storey rear and side extensions); and construction of a raised patio at the rear."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development detailed in the banner above is taken from the appeal form, even though it differs from that detailed on the application form, I am satisfied that it accurately describes the development proposed and is used by both parties.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - i. The character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and the local area.
 - ii. The living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties with particular regard to daylight and outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) (LP1) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two (LP2) are referred to by the Council in the decision notice and, amongst other matters, seeks that new development is of a high quality and contributes positively to the character of the area.
5. I saw at the site visit that the area around the appeal site consists of both bungalows, of a size and style that is comparable to the appeal dwelling, and houses both have long narrow plots with garden space to the front and rear of

the dwellings. The properties are set around an elongated cul-de-sac that incorporates landscaping and mature planting. As a result, the area has an open and verdant character and appearance.

6. The submitted plans show that the appeal scheme would incorporate many of the features found in the houses on Hamlin Crescent, including a hipped roof and matching materials. The appellant has provided details of other development elsewhere in the area, I have not been provided with all the details of these schemes, the policies and circumstances that applied at the time that planning permission was granted. Nonetheless I saw these dwellings at the site visit and they form part of the context of the appeal site and I have had regard to them in reaching my decision.
7. Nonetheless the appeal scheme proposes the fundamental alteration of the character and appearance of the appeal property, from a modest bungalow with accommodation in the roof to a notably more substantial two storey house.
8. However, I saw at the site visit that the appeal scheme would significantly erode the balance of bungalows and houses within the cul-de-sac and introduce a significantly greater mass and scale of development than existing, harming the character and appearance of the area and the appeal property.
9. I therefore find that the appeal scheme is contrary to Policy BE1 of LP1 and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of LP2.

Living conditions

10. The appeal site is a long but narrow plot, the appeal property is situated in close proximity to the neighbouring properties, 7 and 9 Hamlin Crescent. I saw at the site visit that both these properties had windows to the side elevations, which the Officer's report suggests serves habitable rooms.
11. Policy DMHB 11 LP2, amongst other matters, requires that new development should not adversely impact on the occupiers of neighbouring properties.
12. The appellant submits that in respect of No9, the facing windows relate to bathrooms and toilets. Turning to no7 the appellant details and I saw on site that the ground floor window relates to a garage and the facing first floor window relates to a bedroom. The appellant has presented a diagram purporting to show that the appeal scheme would not breach a 45-degree angle from the window, it is clear however that the proposed roof extension would be directly in front of this window (albeit with a little separation) and would inevitably lead to a loss of daylight and outlook as a result.
13. I note that various planning permissions have been granted in respect of works to the adjacent properties. I did not note any work in progress at the time of the site visit nor do I have any substantive evidence before me to suggest that the works will definitely be going ahead. I have therefore based my assessment on the current situation.
14. The appeal scheme would substantially increase the bulk, scale and massing of the appeal property in close proximity to the neighbouring properties harming the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties with particular regards to a loss of daylight and outlook. Therefore, I find that the appeal scheme is contrary to Policy DMHB 11 of LP2.

Other Matters

15. The appellant details that the additional space created by the appeal scheme is needed to facilitate working from home and for growing children. This is primarily a private benefit to the appellant and, while it is nonetheless a material consideration that weighs in favour of the appeal scheme, it does not outweigh the harm I have identified previously.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mr M Brooker

INSPECTOR