

The application site is located on the South Eastern side of Laburnum Avenue, Yiewsley, and comprises an end of terrace property set within a 10 m wide plot. The principle elevation of the property faces West. The property has a large rear garden which backs onto open green space.

This application proposed a single storey side to rear extension. The width of the side element of the extension does not exceed half the width of the original dwellinghouse and has a flat roof with a maximum height of 3 metres. This element of the extension would therefore appear subordinate to the main dwellinghouse and is compliant with the HDAS.

The proposed development has a rearward projection of 4 metres. Paragraph 3.3 of the HDAS states that on semi-detached/ terraced houses on a plot more than 5m wide an extension up to - 3.6m deep is considered acceptable. The proposed development exceeds this guidance by a mere 400mm.

It is noted that the adjoining property, at Number 89 Whitehorn Avenue (to the South-West) has been previously extended to the rear by way of a single storey rear extension projecting approximately 3.6 m to the rear and is separated by a small distance with the application site with an alleyway between. The proposed extension would not therefore result in an unacceptable loss of light or outlook to the occupants of this property.

Number 4 Laburnum Avenue (to the North) has not been extended, however the additional 400mm rearward projection would not result in a loss of light or outlook given the habitable kitchen window at its closest point would be located some 3 metres from the proposed extension. Guidance provided by the Building Research Establishment's report ' Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight 1991 ' recommends that suitable daylight to habitable rooms is achieved where a 25° vertical angle taken from a point 2 metres above the floor of the fenestrated elevation is kept unobstructed.

It is therefore clear that given the proposed extension will be located 3 metres from the nearest habitable window and being only 3 metres in height, the proposed extension would comply with the guidance. In addition it must be noted that the shared boundary also tapers away from No 4 from the 2.2metres mark. The visibility of the extension from No 4 is therefore reduced from 2.2 metres rear of the original rear elevation.

The appellant contends that this 400mm deviation is minimal and given the existing site circumstances detailed above, it is considered that this deviation is not substantial enough nor would it result in any material harm to any of the neighbouring properties that would necessitate withholding planning permission.

The LPA is kindly requested to grant planning permission for this application.