
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2022

by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3282163

20 Roseville Road, Hayes UB3 4QX

- 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 Syed Fahim against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 15490/APP/2021/1989, dated 17 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension at 20 Roseville Road, Hayes UB3 4QX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 15490/APP/2021/1989, dated 17 May 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan; Proposed Block Plan; Dwg No: PA 01; PA 02; PA 03; and PA 04.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 18 Roseville Road (No 18) with particular reference to light and outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling which currently has a single storey rear extension. The attached property (No 18) also has a single storey rear extension and, as such, the full length of the proposed extension would not be fully appreciated from within the ground floor rooms or garden at No 18.
4. Where seen, it would measure 2.6m in height and thus have a particularly low built form which would not be substantially greater than the height of the existing brick wall along the boundary. In this regard, the proposal would not appear unduly oppressive or create a sense of enclosure from within the garden or property at No 18.

5. The proposed extension would be positioned to the south of No 18 where the sun would be at its highest and given the particularly low height of the extension there would not be any significant shadowing effects or loss of daylight.
6. Drawing the above together, the proposal would not result in an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 18 with particular reference to light and outlook.
7. The proposal would extend beyond the limits for single storey rear extensions set down in criterion i of part B of Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) (LP). However, as the proposal would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property it would comply with criterion ii) of part A of this policy. As such, I find no conflict with the overall objectives of Policy DMHD 1 or Policies DMHB 11 of the LP. These stipulate, amongst other things, that planning applications relating to alterations and extensions of dwellings will be required to ensure that a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved.
8. In addition to the standard implementation condition, it is necessary in the interests of precision, to define the plans with which the scheme should accord to those submitted with the application. A condition concerning external materials is required in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
9. For the above reasons the appeal is allowed.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR