
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 September 2016

by Christa Masters MA (hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/16/3152624

60 Sandringham Road, Northolt, Middlesex UB5 5HN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under a development order.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Marc Prema-Ratner against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 162030PALHE, dated 14 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension up to 6 metres depth.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and approval granted under the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Paragraph A4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended)(GPDO) for a single storey rear extension up to 6 metres depth at 60 Sandringham Road, Northolt, Middlesex UB5 5HN in accordance with the details submitted pursuant to Schedule 2, Part 1, Paragraph A4 (2) of the GPDO.

Procedural matters

2. The provisions of the GPDO require the local planning authority to assess the proposed development solely on the basis of its impact on the amenity of any adjoining premises - taking into account any representations received. My determination of this appeal has been made in the same manner.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the existing and future occupiers of No 58 Sandringham Road.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is an end of terrace property. The rear gardens along the terrace are linear and there are existing extensions visible along the terrace.
 5. A representation from the occupier of No 58 raises concerns regarding noise impacts from internal structural alterations and the effect on light levels. The Council have also raised concerns regarding overshadowing.
 6. The property at No 58 has an existing small scale extension at the rear. There are no windows to the flank elevation of this extension facing the appeal site, however there is rear door which is part glazed. There is a window on the rear elevation of the extension. There is existing boundary treatment between the
-

properties which at over 1.8m in height, forms an effective screen between the appeal site and No 58. As the extension would measure approximately 2.6m in height, it would be only visible in part from the rear garden of No 58. Taking into account the size of the rear gardens, the positioning of the windows and the boundary treatment in place, I cannot agree that the visibility of this element of the proposal would result in material harm to the outlook from No 58. In addition, taking into account the height of the proposed extension, I am not convinced that the proposal would cause material harm in terms of overshadowing .

7. In terms of light levels, the properties along the terrace are south facing. The dwellings therefore benefit from significant levels of direct sunlight for a large part of the day. Taking into account the orientation of the dwellings and positioning of the windows to No 58, I am unable to conclude that the proposal would cause any material harm in relation to this issue.
8. The appellant pointed out that a Certificate of Lawfulness has been granted at the appeal site for a 3m deep extension which could measure up to 4m in height and I have been provided with a copy of this decision. I am satisfied that if the appeal proposal were not erected, there is every likelihood that such a fallback would be built. In the circumstances of this particular appeal, I regard the likely erection of such a fallback as a material consideration.
9. To conclude, the proposal would cause no material harm to the living conditions of the existing or future occupiers of No 58 Sandringham Road.

Other Matters

10. Concerns have also been raised regarding the installation of a CCTV camera to the front elevation of the property however this is not a matter for my deliberations.

Conclusion

11. I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and approval granted. In granting approval, the Appellant should note that the GPDO requires at Paragraphs A4 (10), (11) and (12) that the development shall be completed on or before 30th May 2019 and that the developer shall notify the local planning authority in writing of the completion of the development as soon as reasonably practicable after completion. Such notification shall include the name of the developer; the address or location of the development, and the date of completion.

Christa Masters

INSPECTOR