



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 April 2024

**by B J Sims BSc (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 07 May 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3334030**  
**30 Rodmell Close, Hillingdon, UB4 9RS.**

- 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 Ms Nita Champaneri against the decision of Hillingdon Council.
  - The application Ref 48130/APP/2023/2047, dated 11 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 5 September 2023.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a side and rear extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a side and rear extension at 30 Rodmell Close, Hillingdon, UB4 9RS, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 48130/APP/2023/2047, dated 11 July 2023, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three 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:

Location Plan, received 11-07-2023

A2-2383/1, received 11-07-2023

2383.2 REV A, received 30-08-2023

## Main Issue

2. The proposed extension would partly wrap around the existing end-of-terrace house but only at first floor level. Accordingly, the development would not increase the overall plan footprint of the dwelling and it would also be set-back to appear appropriately subordinate to it and in keeping with the character and appearance of the terrace.
3. The sole main issue in the appeal is the effect of the extension on the amenity of the neighbouring house at No 34 Rodmell Close, with respect to dominance, visual intrusion and loss of outlook.

## Reasons

4. The Council relies upon the Development Management Policies of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2. Policy DMHB11 protects the amenity, daylight and

sunlight of adjacent properties and open space from the effects of development. Policy DMHD1 states that two-storey side extensions should be set-in a minimum of 1m from the side boundary and requires a satisfactory relationship between built extensions and adjacent dwellings, with no unacceptable loss of outlook or increased sense of enclosure.

5. The present ground floor of the appeal dwelling stands hard against the side boundary with No 34 and 7.6m away from the neighbouring dwelling itself. The 0.9m wide side element of the first-floor extension would also be hard against the boundary, with the same 7.6 m separation from No 34. Therefore, the side extension would not be in strict conformity with the 1m clearance from the shared boundary stipulated by Policy DMHD1.
6. However, there would be no fenestration in the flank of the extension facing No 34, save for a small fixed, obscure-glazed window to a cupboard. The new first floor construction would be no closer to No 34 than the existing ground floor and the 7.6 space between them would, from inspection, afford reasonable separation.
7. In this particular case, I do not share the view of the Council that the relatively modest scale and bulk of the proposed built development would appear significantly more dominant or visually intrusive from the neighbouring house or garden space at No 34 Rodmell Close than the present ground floor part of No 30. Nor do I consider that it would significantly harm the outlook from that neighbouring property, nor unacceptably reduce natural light reaching it, nor create any undue increased sense of enclosure. The relationship between the two properties would thus remain satisfactory and the amenity of No 34 would be protected, in the terms of Policies DMHD1 and DMHB11.
8. The development would thus cause no harm to the relevant aims of the development plan and any deviation from the strict terms of DMHD1 would be outweighed by the planning benefit due to the enlargement of the living accommodation making more efficient use of appeal site.

*B J Sims*

INSPECTOR