



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 August 2020

by Conor Rafferty LLB (Hons), AIEMA, Solicitor

Decision by Kenneth Stone BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3250834

18 Clovelly Close, Eastcote HA5 2BP

- 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 Prasad Chakradeo against the decision of Hillingdon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 74939/APP/2019/3963, dated 6 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as "erection of single storey rear extension".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey rear extension at 18 Clovelly Place, Eastcote HA5 2BP, in accordance with the terms of the application 74939/APP/2019/3963 dated 6 December 2019 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed Elevations PL-03 Rev A, November 2019; and Existing and Proposed Plans PL-01, November 2019.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed from materials matching that of the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of neighbouring residents at 20 Clovelly Close with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is located at the end of a row of terraced houses on Clovelly Close. The surrounding area is characterised by its residential nature. Clovelly Close is made up of dwellings that vary slightly in size and design but retain a consistency in terms of architecture and character. The dwellings are stepped in nature such

that the rear elevation of the appeal property projects further than the adjoining dwelling at No. 20. The properties also benefit from long, narrow gardens to the rear with fencing that runs along the side boundary.

5. The proposed development involves the erection of a single storey extension to the rear of the appeal property. It would be built from materials to match the remainder of the dwelling and, while modest in scale, would run the entire width of the rear elevation. It would have a flat roof with a sloped section at one side so as to reduce the height of the extension at the boundary with the neighbouring property at No. 20.
6. Policy DMHD1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies, adopted 16 January 2020 (the DMP) states that residential extensions should ensure a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved, highlighting that single storey rear extensions on terraced houses with a plot width of 5 metres or less should not exceed 3.3 metres in depth. It is acknowledged that due to the staggered building line at the properties the proposal would create an overall projection from the rear elevation of No. 18 that would exceed this limit. However, in accordance with the submitted plans, the extension itself would not exceed 3.3 metres in depth.
7. The proposal would introduce a solid element of built form along the boundary line between the appeal property and No. 20, further extending the projection depth of the appeal property beyond the rear elevation of the dwelling at No. 20. This extension would be visible from both the windows along the rear elevation of No. 20 and the rear garden. Its presence would inevitably create a change in the outlook experienced from these locations when looking northeast toward the appeal property. However, this outlook is already somewhat diminished due to the setback nature of the property, looking in part onto the rear projection at No. 18 and the existing boundary treatment. At present the main outlook from the rear windows at No. 20 is experienced when looking northwest towards the long back garden present at the property, which would remain unchanged.
8. While the depth of the projection of the appeal property would be increased by the proposal this would be at single storey level only, and as a result would be largely screened from the views at No. 20 by the boundary treatment running along the entirety of the long rear garden boundary between the properties. This screening, combined with the single storey nature of the development and the sloped, lower roof level of the proposal at the boundary, which reduces to 2.1m, would serve to ensure that the proposal does not appear dominant or overbearing when viewed from either the back garden or rear windows of the neighbouring dwelling at No 20.
9. For similar reasons, it is not considered that the proposal would lead to a significant loss of light for the residents of No. 20. While the extension would increase the built form present along the property boundary, this would not be of a significantly greater height than the fencing already in place. Furthermore, this projection would not run the entire length of the boundary and the long garden present would remain sufficiently open to ensure that adequate light is still available for this dwelling with the proposal in place. Taken together with the orientation of the building and the sun path diagrams

which illustrate a limited impact on direct sunlight resultant from the proposed extension, the effect on light would be limited.

10. For the reasons given above I find that the development would not have a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residents at 20 Clovelly Close with particular regard to outlook and light. Accordingly, it would accord with Policy DMHB11 and DMHD1 of the DMP, which seek to ensure satisfactory living conditions.

Conditions

11. The standard time limit condition as well as a condition that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans are necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have also imposed a condition which requires the materials to match the existing dwelling in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. Having had regard to all matters raised I recommend that the appeal is allowed.

C Rafferty

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, the appeal is allowed.

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR