
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2021

by Rebecca McAndrew BA Hons, PG Dip Urban Design, MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3269400
1D Yew Avenue, West Drayton UB7 8PA

- 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 Mrs Monika Siewierska against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 75910/APP/2020/3631, dated 6 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the level of private garden space.

Reasons

3. Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020)(HLP2DMP) requires a dwelling of this size to have a private garden which is a minimum of 40 square metres. The appellant's existing private garden area already falls significantly below this minimum standard and the appeal scheme would further reduce this space to an even more unacceptable level. This small substandard garden would limit the level of general outdoor activity which residents could reasonably expect for a property of this size.
4. I recognise that the appellant advises that they would be satisfied with the level of garden space which would be retained and that there has been a need for additional indoor space during the pandemic. However, the benefits of securing the limited area of additional indoor space, would not outweigh the overall harm which I have identified to living conditions.
5. In conclusion, given the limited size of the remaining garden area, the scheme would not secure an adequate standard of living conditions for the occupants. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policies DM11, DMHD 1 and DMHB 18 of the HLP2DMP and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) which, taken together, seek to ensure adequate private garden space is secured for dwellings.

Other matters

6. I have considered the information submitted by the appellant in respect of a nearby development for a single storey rear extension, which was allowed at appeal. I note this consent predates both the HLP2DMP and the current London Plan. In any event, each proposal must be considered on its own merit. As such, I have found the appeal would result in significant harm as I have previously set out.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR