



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2023

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 August 2023.

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3318371

45 Greenacres Avenue, Ickenham, Uxbridge UB10 8HH

- 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 Taljinder Kaur Khora against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 53023/APP/2022/3724 dated 7 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is for a single-storey side and rear extension following demolition of existing garage and conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single-storey side and rear extension following demolition of existing garage and conservatory at 45 Greenacres Avenue, Ickenham, Uxbridge UB10 8HH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 77097/APP/2022/3630 dated 30 November 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2022/154 -01A, 2022/154 -02, 2022/154 -03B, 2022/154 -04B, 2022/154 -05B, and 2022/154 -06A.
 - 3) 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.43, with particular regard to light, overbearing impact and outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow with a hipped roof. The extension would infill the area to the side and wrap around to the rear extending across the full width of the property. Whilst the projection to the rear would not be significantly greater than the existing conservatory, a continuous and extensive length of side elevation would be created adjacent to the shared boundary with No.43.

4. Currently, a garage and an outbuilding are positioned along this boundary together with fencing and high hedging further to the rear. The appeal property also has a deeper form than the neighbour, No.43, which is a two-storey house and is offset from the boundary. Whilst the length of the built form up to the boundary would increase, the eaves of the extension would align with those of the existing bungalow and the height of the garage.
5. My attention has also been drawn to a large extension to No.48. The details of that scheme are not before me, nonetheless, I did see from my site visit that the form and depth of properties along Greenacres Avenue vary, and many have single storey built-form up to the side boundaries. The plots are relatively wide, and the properties have lengthy rear gardens, the appeal property and its neighbour reflect this.
6. Due to the low profile of the development, it would not have a significant impact on light or sunlight to the neighbouring property. The extension would be visible from the neighbouring property, however, the extent of the projection above the boundary would be limited and significantly lower than the height of the bungalow. The rear projection would only extend along a small proportion of the garden which is currently well-screened.
7. Therefore, given the form of the extension, I do not find that it would be an overly oppressive addition such that it would cause a harmful erosion to the level of outlook currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No.43 or have an enclosing and overbearing impact. As a result, the extension would not be likely to result in any significant adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property. Thus, the proposal would accord with Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) which amongst other things require that development proposals achieve a satisfactory relationship with the adjacent dwelling and ensure that there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

Conditions and Conclusion

8. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed, subject to conditions to ensure compliance with the statutory requirements relating to the commencement of development and the plans in order to provide certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring the materials of the approved development to match the existing property in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
9. For the reasons set out the appeal is allowed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR