

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 October 2018

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 October 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/18/3206727

6 Hollywood Gardens, Hayes UB4 0DX

- 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 Mrs Sadaf Arfan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 10879/APP/2018/1077, dated 21 March 2018, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2018.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have substituted the description of development given in the application form for that used by the Council in the decision notice. This summarises the development more succinctly than the general background narrative presented in the application.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 8 Hollywood Gardens with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

4. The host property is a mid-terrace dwelling that already has a single storey flat roofed rear extension. The appeal proposal would add to the projection of that existing extension, and it is indicated from the plans submitted that the total rear projection would be 5m. If constructed, the rear extension would then match the projection of the existing single storey rear extension at No 4.
5. No 8 has French doors to the rear elevation, and a small rear extension to the side away from the appeal property. The outlook from the rear of No 8 and the daylight currently available to it is partially restricted by the existing extension on the appeal property, and to a lesser extent, by a rear extension to No 10. However the rear elevation of No 8 retains a clear aspect between the walls of these extensions and this space enables daylight to penetrate.
6. The additional depth proposed by the appeal extension would be significantly greater than the advice given in the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document : Residential Extensions (2008) (the HDAS). The additional depth of the proposed extension would introduce

considerable additional built form close to the boundary, adjacent to the French doors of No 8 which, I could see from my site visit, undoubtedly provide significant natural light to the habitable room beyond. I find the additional projection would result in a sense of enclosure, confinement and an overbearing effect when seen from the French doors, substantially reducing the amount of daylight available to that property at ground floor level.

7. I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 8 Hollywood Gardens, with particular regard to outlook and light. It would conflict with the Development Plan, in particular policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan : Part Two – Saved UDP Policies (2012), which together with the HDAS seek to ensure that proposals safeguard the amenities of existing housing, do not result in the loss of residential amenity and give guidance on the appropriate sizing and design of residential extensions.

Other Matters

8. The appellants have supplied me with photographs of a marquee erected in the rear garden of No 8. No such structure was present when I visited the site, and I have not been made aware of any information regarding its lawfulness. In the circumstances, I find the evidence before me does not provide good reason to out-weigh the harm I have identified in this proposal, which I have determined on its individual merits.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR