

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 July 2023

**by Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 17 August 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3319021**

**63 Long Drive, Ruislip HA4 0HN**

- 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 Surinder Sidhu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref 47034/APP/2022/3861, dated 21 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 February 2023.
  - The development proposed is 2 storey side extension and part rear extensions.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 2 storey side extension and part rear extensions at 63 Long Drive, Ruislip HA4 0HN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 47034/APP/2022/3861, dated 21 December 2022, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
  - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan, Block Plan, SIDHU/PLAN/001, SIDHU/PLAN/002, SIDHU/PLAN/003, SIDHU/PLAN/004.

### Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 69 Long Drive (No 69).

### Reasons

3. The appeal property (No 63) is sited well behind its neighbour at No 69 due to their staggered plot layout at a bend in the road. The front of No 63 broadly aligns with the original rear of No 69, which has since been extended at ground floor level. Views from the rear of No 69 are angled slightly towards the rear of No 63. Due to this spatial arrangement, the appeal property already impacts on the neighbouring house. The rears of the adjoining properties are west facing and they and the part of their gardens closest to the houses are shaded for most of the day.

4. The side elevation of the existing rear extension to No 63 is set in from the shared boundary. It is proposed to infill this area and to construct an extension projecting some 2m beyond the existing rear wall. The boundary treatment would be retained. The site-specific circumstances of this case lead me to conclude that development closer to the boundary would have a minimal, but acceptable, additional impact on the neighbours' living conditions in terms of the potential for loss of light and outlook from the rear windows and patio. The proposed extension would not be a more overbearing form of development than that which already exists. The property at No 71 is not extended at the rear and therefore the proposed development would not enclose any space, or thereby lead to the creation of a sense of enclosure for No 69 as the Council states. For the foregoing reasons, the single storey element of the appeal proposal would not harm neighbouring living conditions.
5. No 69's first-floor window nearest to the proposed development appears to serve a bathroom. The rear bedroom window is some distance from the shared boundary. A 45-degree sight line has been provided to demonstrate that the first-floor extension would have no adverse effect on daylight and sunlight levels to habitable rooms. The Council raises no specific objections to the first-floor element of the proposal and there are no reasons to disagree. The proposal would be acceptable in this regard.
6. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal proposal would not harm the amenities of the occupiers of No 69 and would not be contrary to Policies DMHD1 and DMHB11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two (2020), which in summary and of relevance to this appeal state that extensions should have no adverse impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties. There would be no conflict with the requirement for quality design set out in Policies D3, D4 and D6 of the London Plan and in the National Planning Policy Framework. Accordingly, planning permission is granted.

#### *Conditions*

7. A condition is necessary requiring the use of matching materials to preserve the character and appearance of the surrounding area. I have included a condition identifying the approved drawings for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

*Elaine Benson*

INSPECTOR