
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2017

by Michael Moffoot DipTP MRTPI DipMgt MCMI

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

Decision date: 8th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3163599
27 Drakes Drive, Northwood HA6 2SL

- 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 & Mrs Dossa against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref: 62831/APP/2016/3078, dated 11 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and alterations to front elevation to provide new entrance lobby.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed in respect of the single storey rear extension.
2. The appeal is allowed in respect of the alterations to front elevation to provide a new entrance lobby, and planning permission is granted for alterations to front elevation to provide new entrance lobby at 27 Drakes Drive, Northwood HA6 2SL in accordance with the terms of the application ref: 62831/APP/2016/3078, dated 11 August 2016 and the plans submitted with it so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 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 permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: (i) 1:1250 scale location plan; (ii) 1:500 scale site/block plan; and (iii) drawing no 01 Rev -A.

Preliminary Matter

3. There is no dispute between the parties regarding the acceptability of the proposed alterations to the front elevation to form an entrance lobby. I am satisfied that this aspect of the proposals would cause no material harm, and would not conflict with any development plan policies I have been referred to. I shall therefore confine my detailed considerations to the rear extension.
-

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 28 Drakes Drive, with particular reference to outlook, daylight and sunlight.

Reasons

5. The appeal property comprises a modern two-storey dwelling set on a fairly generous plot in an area characterised by detached properties on large sites in a predominantly residential part of Northwood. No 28 lies to the immediate north of the property and is of a similar design and form.
6. Paragraph 3.1 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: *Residential Extensions*¹ (SPD) states that a single-storey rear extension should not protrude out too far from the rear wall of the original house as it may block daylight and sunlight received by neighbouring properties. For detached houses an extension of up to 4m deep is considered acceptable.
7. At its deepest the proposed flat roofed, L-shaped extension would project about 4.5m from the rear of the dwelling and would therefore breach the SPD threshold. It would be situated close to the boundary with No 28 which is defined by a close-boarded timber fence about 1.8m high. The upper part of the extension would be clearly visible above the fence and at close quarters from the living room of No 28 which features French doors that open on to a patio and garden area. The impact of the extension on the outlook from the room and patio would be compounded as the rear wall of No 28 is set back from the rear wall of the appeal property. As a result, it would be a dominant and oppressive addition that would severely harm the neighbouring occupiers' outlook.
8. The extension would be to the south of No 28. Given the size of the proposal and its proximity to the neighbouring dwelling, the development would result in a marked reduction of daylight and sunlight reaching the living room and patio area to No 28 during the afternoon period. Whilst this would not in itself warrant dismissal of the appeal proposal it adds weight to my concerns regarding the impact on the neighbouring occupiers' living conditions.
9. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposed development would seriously harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 28 Drakes Drive. It would therefore conflict with those parts of saved policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Local Plan² which seek to safeguard the residential amenities of an area and require, amongst other things, adequate daylight and sunlight for existing houses.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should fail in respect of the rear extension. The alterations to the front elevation to provide a new entrance lobby are an independent element of the proposal that is capable of a separate decision, and the appeal should succeed in this respect.

¹ Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions (2008)

² Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Saved UDP Policies (2012)

11. As to conditions, I shall require the use of matching materials in the interests of visual amenity. It is also necessary to list the approved plans to provide certainty.

Michael Moffoot

Inspector