



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 December 2024

by **A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 January 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3350994**

**54 Providence Road West Drayton UB7 8HJ**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Ms Faliha Abdulreda against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref is 77946/APP/2024/1628.
  - The development proposed is 4.3m Ground floor rear extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 4.3m Ground floor rear extension at 54 Providence Road West Drayton UB7 8HJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 77946/APP/2024/1628 and the plans submitted with it, 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: UB7/02 and UB7/03

### Preliminary Matter

2. The planning application referred to a 'statement from the applicant's children' being included and it is presumed this is the letter referred to in the Council's report outlining the health circumstances of the appellant. The Council's assessment refers to an insufficiency of evidence, however I have been supplied with correspondence from the appellant's medical practitioners and from the appellant herself which I have taken into account in so far as these are relevant to the proposal.

### Main Issue(s)

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon living conditions for occupiers of 52 Providence Road.

### Reasons

4. The appeal site (No.54) is a terraced two-storey dwelling in an established residential area. In addition to the extension proposed to be replaced, the modest rear garden includes a metal storage shed and a high boundary screen (with pergola attached) which runs from the rear elevation of No.54 along the shared

boundary with No 52, an adjoining, un-extended, end-of-terrace dwelling. These structures, particularly the solid boundary screen which attains an unbroken height of more than 2 metres, are material to the effect of what is proposed. Although the Council suggest the proposal would “potentially create a loss of light and overshadowing to No.52” it is not clear on what basis that conclusion is reached as there is no reference to the existing boundary treatment which the proposed extension would replace, although that boundary treatment plainly constrains existing outlook to a very significant degree.

5. The proposed extension would be approximately 70cm larger than an extension previously approved<sup>1</sup>. Other than a (roughly)<sup>2</sup> 30cm excess height above the existing boundary structure, this additional length would be no more apparent to neighbouring users than what is currently approved. Given the existing interference with the subtended angle set out in A1.24 of Appendix A of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) (HLP Part 2) and the relatively open aspect of the adjoining garden which faces south, with regard to daylight and overshadowing, the degree of change from what exists would be small and not unacceptable in the circumstances described.
6. I therefore conclude there would little conflict with Policy DMHD 1 of the HLP Part 2 which seeks to ensure development does not cause an unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring users.

### **Other Matters**

7. The appellant has written with reference to health conditions which have caused “...significant mobility issues (such) that I am no longer able to use stairs safely or comfortably” and has provided correspondence and reports which date from 2017. My observations were<sup>3</sup> that these problems appear to continue. The application proposes a ground floor bedroom, shower room and WC within the extension which would, plainly, avoid the need for the occupiers to climb stairs. Notwithstanding my conclusion on the main issue this is a benefit of the scheme which should attract significant weight in the circumstances before me.
8. To conclude overall, the proposed extension would cause no unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbouring users and further weight in favour of the proposal arises from the provision of otherwise absent facilities at ground floor level. I consider the proposal accords with the development plan as a whole and, consequently, for the reasons given and taking all matters raised into account, the appeal succeeds subject to the usual plans and timing conditions.

*Andrew Boughton*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> The Council explain that approval 77946/APP/2023/1165 projects 3.6m but its description refers to a 4.0m depth

<sup>2</sup> The roof of both proposals slope

<sup>3</sup> At the site visit