



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2024

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 01.02.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3333325

Una Cottage, Cuckoo Hill, Eastcote HA5 2BB

- 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 Abhishek Sandhir against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 25794/APP/2023/1611, dated 1 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 25 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear side loft conversion with dormer to increase height.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The amendments of the National Planning Policy Framework were published in December 2023. These amendments do not alter the basis upon which this appeal has been assessed.

Main Issue

3. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached bungalow with accommodation within the roofspace. From what was observed during the site visit, the dwellings within the surrounding area do not have a consistency of design. The dwellings referred to by the appellant, known as Whitelades and 65 High View, were observed during the site visit. However, the full planning circumstances of any alterations to these dwellings has not been provided and it was noted that neither were of a similar design as the property. For these reasons only limited weight is given to these other schemes in the determination of this appeal.
5. The property is sited adjacent to the Raisins Hill Area of Special Local Character which, where it abuts the curtilage of Una Cottage, comprises the Catlin's Lane Open Space. By reason of the property being outside the designated area and adjoined by the open space, only limited weight is given to the Council's concerns associated with any harm to the setting of Eastcote Point and the

- adjacent group of properties which are considered to be non-designated heritage assets.
6. The neighbouring Cuckoo Hill Farmhouse is a Grade II Listed Building and there is a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Although a generalised concern on heritage grounds is raised in the reason for refusal, the Council has not explicitly identified that the proposed alterations to the host property would result in less than substantial harm to the setting of this Listed Building. By reason of the scale and siting of the proposed development there would not be harm caused to the setting of the Listed Building.
 7. In the absence of any specific harm to designated and non-designated heritage assets, the proposed development would not conflict with Policy DMHB 5 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (HLP) and Policy HC1 of the London Plan (LP).
 8. The proposed development includes alterations to the property's roof to create additional accommodation within the roofspace. No material changes would be made to the front roofslope but the proposed side dormer would be seen from Cuckoo Hill. Although larger than the existing dormers, including one within the other side roofslope, the erection of the proposed dormer would not significantly alter the contribution of host property to the character and appearance of the streetscene. The property would retain the appearance of a hipped roof bungalow with dormers.
 9. At the rear, an extension is proposed to the roof which would be visible from the adjacent open space which includes a public right of way. This extension would be a bulky addition to the property and be of a design which would not respect its character. Although the extension would have a hipped roof, it would visually and physically dominate the appearance of the property's rear elevation rather than be a subordinate addition. The proposed crown roof would not be a visually significant addition but it would still be noticeable when viewed from the open space. It adds in a limited way to the unacceptable harm which has been identified.
 10. Although there would not be harm caused to the identified heritage assets and the streetscene, these matters are outweighed by the unacceptable harm which has been identified to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, including views from the adjacent open space.
 11. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would conflict with HLP Policies BE1, DMHB 11 and DMHD 1. Amongst other matters these policies require development, including extensions, to be of a high quality of design, including by reason of scale and architectural composition, and for rear extensions not to create a dominant appearance out of scale with the rest of a building. LP Policy D3 is primarily directed at optimising site capacity through the design-led approach rather than the design of extensions. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR