



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2023

by G Rollings BA(Hons) MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3318369

261 Long Lane, Hillingdon, Uxbridge, UB10 9JR

- 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 Amardeep Singh against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 12883/APP/2022/3362, dated 2 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 29 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part single storey, part double storey side extension and double storey rear extension with loft conversion and roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a part single storey, part double storey side extension and double storey rear extension with loft conversion and roof lights at 261 Long Lane, Hillingdon, Uxbridge, UB10 9JR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 12883/APP/2022/3362, dated 2 November 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 21/3445/303; 21/3445/306; 21/3445/307.
 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.

Preliminary Matters

2. The original description of development set out on the application form was "loft conversion". I have used the description of development set out by the Council on its decision notice, as this describes the development in fuller terms. The appellant has not objected to this description.
3. The property has recently been the subject of Council approval¹ for substantial extensions similar at ground- and first-floor levels to those proposed in this appeal. I noticed during my site visit that these works had not yet commenced. However, this appeal proposal differs by including loft-level accommodation housed under a portion of flat, or 'crown', roof with the realigned roof profile replacing the twin rear-facing gables proposed as part of the permitted scheme. Given the extant permission for much of what is proposed within the

¹ Council ref: 12883/APP/2022/1369.

appeal scheme, my consideration in this appeal is limited to the impact of the proposed loft extension and crown roof, as well as the cumulative impact of these works and the previously approved components.

4. There is a tree protection order on the property. Having considered the proposed works, I am satisfied that no protected trees would be affected.
5. The *National Planning Policy Framework* (2023) (the Framework) has been updated, and this supersedes the 2021 version quoted in the application.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

7. The appeal site currently accommodates a detached two-storey house on a well-treed site and is surrounded by similar homes. It lies within the Council's Hillingdon Court Park Area of Special Local Character (ASLC).
8. The Council's *Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies* (2020) (the DMP) Policy DMHD 1 states that large crown roofs on detached houses will not be supported. However, during my visit to the area, I noticed large crown roofs on many other homes within the surrounding area, in numbers large enough to affect the overall character of the area. These included an example at the neighbouring 6 Parkway, which is visible from the street and appeal site, and also within the ASLC.
9. Within the street scenes of Long Lane and Parkway, the elevations of the proposed development would not appear substantially different to that of the approved scheme. Accordingly, there would be no additional harm to the character of the area when considered from public viewpoints. The overall cumulative visual impact of the proposed roof extension compared with the extant approved components of the proposal, and their impact on the ASLC, would be minimal when compared with the previously allowed scheme.
10. Policy DMHD 1 does not define what would be considered a "large" area. However, given the overall roof area of the property and the comparable examples found elsewhere in the area, I do not consider the proposed crown roof, at 17.5% of the overall roof area as measured by the appellant, to be large.
11. Overall, the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. There would be no conflict with the development plan for the area, which includes Policy DMHD 1, as well as DMP Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 5, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12, the Council's *Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies* (2012) BE1 and HE1, and *The London Plan* (2021) Policies HC1, D4 and D8. Together, these design and heritage policies seek to protect locally recognised historic features and ensure that new development is designed to the highest standards, amongst other considerations.
12. The proposal would also not conflict with the Framework. In particular I have had regard to paragraph 203, which states that the effect of an application on

the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application.

Other Matters

13. An objection was received from the occupier of a neighbouring property concerning potential light loss as a result of the proposed roof works. Compared with the ridge lines of the previously approved scheme, the proposed roof profile would not result in additional noticeable loss of light to that property, and the overall effect of the proposal would be minimal.

Conditions

14. I have assessed the list of conditions proposed by the Council against the tests set out in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)². Condition 2 is included for the absence of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, and condition 3 is applied to preserve the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

15. There are no material considerations to indicate that I should decide otherwise in accordance with the development plan for the purposes of this appeal. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

G Rollings

INSPECTOR

² PPG reference ID: 21a-003-20190723; revision date: 23 07 2019.