
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2021

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3263308
86 Ducks Hill Road, Northwood HA6 2SD

- 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 and Mrs Pardeep Kalsi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 49961/APP/2020/2735, dated 28 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is the construction of additional storey above the existing bungalow and part two, part single storey front, side and rear extension and raised rear decking area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbours.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this detached bungalow, which has accommodation within the roof, situated within a residential area. The area comprises properties of differing styles and designs, mainly being detached houses. The land here drops steeply from south to north such that the neighbouring detached house at No 88 is set on higher ground than the appeal property, which itself is set higher than the neighbour to the north, No 84.
4. No 88 is a 2 storey house and its flank elevation contains windows at its first floor which face over the appeal site. It seems to be agreed by the Council and the appellant that one of these windows is the sole source of light and outlook to a bedroom within No 88. No 84 is a detached 2 storey property with some accommodation within its roof. Although the windows in the flank elevation facing the appeal site do not serve habitable rooms, the rooflights in the side roof-slope serve habitable rooms.
5. The proposal would involve the addition of a much larger first floor at the appeal site, which would include a full first floor eaves height to the sides, with hipped roof-slopes. In relation to No 88, this would mean that the outlook from the side bedroom window would be altered. From my observations at my site visit, it would seem that the outlook from that room within No 88 would

not be unduly affected by the presence of the existing bungalow. The proposal would result in the side wall and roof of the extended property being around 7.6m and 8.5m away, according to the figures set out by the Council and the appellant. Although it would still be possible to look out from that window in No 88 above the proposed extension, I consider that the proposed extension would appear immediate and over-dominant due to its size and proximity. I consider that this would have an unacceptable effect on the residents at No 88, due to the overbearing nature and loss of outlook from that identified bedroom.

6. In relation to No 84 the 2 facing roof-lights are said to serve a living area and a bedroom. For the bedroom, the roof-light is the only source of light and the living area is served by others. The residents at No 84 indicate that the sill height of the roof-lights is 1.3m above the floor height and the submitted photographs seem to support this. I can see that anyone within those rooms would be afforded a clear view of the proposed extension, rather than a view sky-wards as suggested by the appellants. From these windows I consider that the proposed extension would appear dominating and would have an unacceptable effect on the outlook for the neighbouring residents.
7. I have taken account of the variety of dwellings within the area, some much larger than the current appeal property. However, the differing styles, designs and configuration of these dwellings means that some can be acceptably extended whilst others may have an unacceptable effect on neighbours were they to be extended in a similar fashion. I have also taken account of the planning history of the property and the appellants' efforts to meet the concerns expressed in their outcome. However, for the reasons set out above, I consider that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on neighbours, contrary to Policies DMHB11 and DMHD1 of the Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies. As a consequence, the appeal is dismissed.

ST Wood

INSPECTOR