



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025

by S Simms BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/25/3368240

6 Brandville Road, West Drayton UB7 9DA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Shloimy Shok against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application ref. is 39409/APP/2025/818.
 - The development proposed is dormer extension and the conversion from a single dwelling house into two 3-bed self-contained flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Shloimy Shok against the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon. This is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of development on the decision notice differs from that on the application form but there is no evidence the applicant consented to the change, so I have dealt with the appeal based on the description in the application form.
4. The drawings, including a schedule, show the upper flat as 2-bedroom with a play room. The application form states that both flats would be 3-bedroom. I have dealt with the appeal based on the latter as it also matches the description.
5. Whilst the Council's officer report, which considered the application, stated that cycle parking was not proposed, this did not form a reason for refusal and its Statement of Case is clear that adequate cycle parking is proposed.

Main Issues

6. The main issues in this appeal are whether the proposed development would:
 - provide an adequate standard of living accommodation for future occupiers with particular regard to daylight, sunlight and privacy; and
 - have an acceptable effect on highway safety and the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to parking.

Reasons

Living conditions – future occupiers

7. The appeal site contains a two-storey semi-detached house. It has a dual pitched gable roof and a single-storey flat-roofed extension to the end of a two-storey rear outrigger. The front garden is block paved with a low front wall. The rear garden has a single storey flat-roofed outbuilding across its full width at the end. A side passageway leads to the rear through a covered area alongside the outrigger.
8. The proposal would convert the house into two flats: The lower would use the ground floor, which would include an extension with a monopitch roof that would replace the covered area. The upper would use the first floor and a converted loft with dormer extensions to the main and outrigger roofs.
9. Both flats would be accessed via a hallway from the existing front door. Stores for cycles and bins would be built in the front garden. One of the bedrooms in the lower flat would be formed from part of the outrigger and part of an extension on the covered area alongside it. It would have a rooflight and a window facing down the side passageway towards the street.
10. The Council is concerned that this bedroom would not have adequate daylight, sunlight or privacy. The appellant provides no analysis or calculations to refute this but relies on the drawings showing that there would be two windows with different aspects. Whilst this may be the best that could be done, it would not, in my view, be adequate. This is because the orientation of the windows is such that they would receive little or no sunlight and their enclosure by nearby walls would limit the proportion of the sky visible from them, and therefore daylight.
11. Furthermore, neighbouring residents using their side passageway would pass by close to the proposed vertical window, compromising privacy. A taller fence might be erected to deal with this, but that would further exacerbate harm due to poor living conditions as a result of inadequate daylight and sunlight. As the description of development omits the rebuilding of a covered area used as a laundry, which the Council consider it essential to re-build prior to occupation, a condition would have been necessary to require this had I been minded to allow the appeal.
12. Overall, the proposed development would not provide an adequate standard of living accommodation for future occupiers with regard to daylight, sunlight or privacy, contrary to Policies D4 and D6 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020), which require development to provide sufficient daylight and sunlight that is appropriate for its context.

Parking

13. The area is residential and suburban, albeit West Drayton town centre is within walking distance, with several bus routes and a busy railway station. Many front boundary treatments have been removed and gardens surfaced for parking, but a few retain low walls. The site fronts on to a street with road humps and marked on-street parking bays, restricted to resident permit holders from 9am to 5pm Monday to Friday. On the adjoining Warwick Road, closer to the railway station, bays are restricted to permit holders from 9am to 10pm on every day. These restrictions indicate long-term parking stress, with peak demand exceeding supply.

14. The appellant states that a future agreement could be secured by condition or other means to prevent occupiers applying for parking permits but nonetheless has submitted a document intended as a unilateral undertaking to the appeal. The Planning Practice Guidance¹ is clear that a condition requiring an agreement is unlikely to be enforceable. Furthermore, I am not satisfied that the document is legally effective as an obligation. For example, there is no evidence of title, it is not signed by the owner, the witness has not signed using an appropriate method, it does not clearly bind successors in title and there is no plan identifying the site.
15. Therefore, I cannot be sure the effect on highway safety and the living conditions of neighbours, with particular regard to parking, would be acceptable, contrary to Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020) and Policies T4 and T6.1 of the London Plan (2021), which seek to mitigate transport impacts, promote non-car modes, support car-free development and limit parking based on public transport accessibility.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

S Simms

INSPECTOR

¹ Reference ID: 21a-010-20190723