



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 September 2019

by Martin Chandler BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/19/3229069

Ground Floor Flat, 14 Marlborough Road, Uxbridge UB10 0PR

- 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 Resham S Kieir against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 16447/APP/2019/662, dated 25 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single storey rear extension with flat roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a single storey rear extension with flat roof at Ground Floor Flat, 14 Marlborough Road, Uxbridge UB10 0PR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16447/APP/2019/662, dated 25 February 2019, and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matter

2. The appeal seeks retrospective planning permission for the extension. On site it was apparent that the window that has been installed differs in appearance from that shown on the proposed drawing. In addition, the submitted rear elevation drawing shows the hipped roof of the existing dwelling to be on the wrong side of the house. In this respect therefore, it is an inaccurate drawing.
3. Despite this, these drawing errors have no bearing on the nature of the proposal or on the main issue. Consequently, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the drawings that are before me, and in doing this, I am satisfied that the interests of the main parties have not been affected.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupants of 16 Marlborough Road.

Reasons

5. The Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Extensions (2008) (SPD) states that careful thought must be given to single storey rear extensions having regard to the effect such a proposal can have on neighbouring residents and their gardens. In terms of depth, the SPD provides a guideline which suggests that the depth of such an extension should be no more than 3.6 metres. The reasons given for

this are to enable an extension to appear subordinate to the original house and due to the potential to block daylight and sunlight.

6. The rear extension is 6 metres in depth and is located next to the shared side boundary with No 16. The depth of the extension therefore breaches the upper guideline provided by the SPD. However, the levels of the site are such that there is a step down from the original house into the extension. The extension also has a flat roof. The combination of these design features has the effect of reducing the overall height of the addition so that it is not significantly taller than the existing boundary treatment. Due to this height, although the extension is a deep addition, I am satisfied that the proposal would not harm the outlook from the adjoining property. Moreover, the limited height also ensures that daylight and sunlight will not be unduly affected. The extension would therefore not conflict with the aspirations of the SPD.
7. Therefore, for the reasons identified above, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of the occupants of 16 Marlborough Road. Consequently, the proposal accords with Policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (adopted 1998) Saved Policies (September 2007) and guidance contained within the SPD. Taken together these seek development which complements the amenity of the area, safeguards the amenities of existing houses, and does not result in a significant loss of residential amenity.

Conclusion

8. The appeal is allowed and due to its retrospective nature, no conditions are necessary.

Martin Chandler

INSPECTOR