

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2017

by J Dowling BA(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3164846
18 Winnock Road, West Drayton UB7 7RH

- 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 Mr Purewal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 3353/APP/2016/3637, dated 30 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. This appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extensions at 18 Winnock Road, West Drayton UB7 7RH in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 3353/APP/2016/3637, dated 30 September 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this permission.
 - 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 approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: WR PA 01 rev A and WR PA 03 rev A.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 16 Winnock Road with particular reference to outlook and light.

Reasons

3. 18 Winnock Road is a two storey terraced property. Although located in the middle of Winnock Road the property is an end of terrace unit as a pedestrian access runs between Nos 16 and 18. The property has planning permission for a single storey rear extension¹. The appeal proposal would have the same design, height and layout as the consented scheme except that the element adjacent to the boundary with 16 Winnock Road would project further rearwards. It is therefore the effect that this increase in depth would have on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 16 that falls to be considered.
4. Detailed guidance on extensions is contained within the Hillingdon Design and Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions (2008) (the SPD) which advocates that in order to prevent sunlight and

¹ LPA reference: 3353/APP/2016/3001

daylight being blocked to neighbouring properties extensions on this type of property should have a maximum depth of 3.3m.²

5. The proposed extension would exceed the recommended maximum depth for this type of property. However, given the orientation and the fact that the proposed extension would have a flat roof which would sit behind and below the extended outrigger that would have a substantially higher mono pitch roof I consider that any loss of light or overshadowing to No 16 from the proposed increase in depth over the consented scheme would be very limited and as a consequence would not adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of this property.
6. I observed at my site visit that in addition to a window in the rear elevation No 16 has a number of windows and a door in the outrigger element that would face directly onto the proposed extension. However, in addition to being separated by the pedestrian access that runs between the two properties both No 16 and No 18 have relatively high fences along their respective boundaries. As a consequence given the proposed flat roof design and height of the proposal the amount of extension that would be visible to the occupiers of No 16 would be limited and as a consequence, on balance, I consider would not be visually intrusive, over dominant or adversely affect the outlook of the occupiers of this property.
7. As a result I conclude that whilst the proposal may not be in accordance with the guidance contained within the SPD it would comply with policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (adopted 1998) Saved Policies (2007) which seek to protect residential amenity. The purpose of these policies is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks, amongst other things to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupiers of buildings.

Conditions

8. Paragraph 206 of the Framework sets out a number of tests that conditions need to meet. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against paragraph 206 and judge that they meet these tests. In addition to the standard time limit, for clarity and in the interests of the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, a condition requiring matching external materials to be used in the construction of the extension has been attached. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, I have also imposed a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

Jo Dowling

INSPECTOR

² Paragraph 3.3