
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2019

by R Morgan MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3232688

9 Monmouth Road, Hayes UB3 4JQ

- 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 N Dhau against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 55184/APP/2019/967, dated 15 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 May 2019.
 - The development is a single storey rear conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Procedural Matter

2. The Council changed the description of development from conservatory to extension. This more appropriately describes the development and I have assessed the appeal on this basis as nobody would be prejudiced or caused any injustice by my doing so. The extension has already been erected and therefore I am considering the appeal scheme retrospectively.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers of 11 Monmouth Road with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached house with a fairly long back garden. The house, which was originally modest in size, has been extended significantly at the rear through the addition of a roof dormer and full width, flat roofed single storey extension. The extension which is the subject of this appeal is a part brick, part glazed building with a plastic roof which is approximately half of the width of the house and projects along the boundary with 11 Monmouth Road (No 11) for around 3.5 metres beyond the first extension.
5. The extension increases the built development along the boundary with No 11, which has not been extended at the rear, well beyond the guidelines set out in the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document (HDAS). The purpose of the HDAS limits is to avoid loss of daylight, sunlight or outlook to neighbouring properties.

6. The development has resulted in a long, high wall along the boundary which appears overbearing. The rear of both properties are northerly facing so will not get much direct sunlight, but the combined effect of both the single storey extensions will be to significantly reduce natural light to the rear ground floor habitable rooms of No 11.
7. Whilst I acknowledge that the neighbour at No 11 has written in support of the extension, it is important to consider the living conditions of future occupiers as well as those currently residing at the property.
8. I note the examples of other rear extensions in the area shown on the photographs provided by the appellant. However, different circumstances will have applied in each case, and indeed some may not have planning permission. In any event, I am not bound by other decisions of the Council and have determined this appeal on its own merits.
9. I conclude that the development causes harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers of 11 Monmouth Road with particular regard to outlook and light. It conflicts with Policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies 2007 regarding the protection of residential amenity, and the detailed guidance contained in the HDAS Residential Extensions SPD 2008.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Rosie Morgan

INSPECTOR