

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 May 2017

by David Spencer BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3170612

20 Park Close, Hounslow, Middlesex TW3 2HW

- 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 Ms Lisa Foley against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00853/20/P2, dated 12 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is new rear single storey detached garden store and new single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a new rear single storey detached garden store and new single storey rear extension at 20 Park Close, Hounslow, Middlesex TW3 2HW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00853/20/P2, 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: Site Location Plan at 1:1250 scale and Drawing Nos. BRJ/JA, BRJ/1, BRJ/2 Rev A and BRJ/J3.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. Concurrent to the planning application the appellant also sought determination for prior approval for a "ground floor rear extension 4.2m deep, 2.2m high to the eaves with a maximum height of 3.3m" under notification reference 00853/20/PA2. The Local Planning Authority (LPA) determined that prior approval was needed and refused that application on 30 January 2017 following neighbour consultation.
 3. In essence the two proposals are one and the same and there is some degree of cross-referencing in the appeal material before me. For the avoidance of doubt I have dealt with the appeal as relating to the planning application based on the 00853/20/P2 reference used by both the appellant and Local Planning Authority (LPA) in their appeal submissions. Accordingly, I have taken the description of the appeal proposal from the planning application form.
-

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed extension on the living conditions at neighbouring properties in terms of outlook and light levels and on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. No.20 Park Close is the middle property in a short row of three two-storey dwellings. The row is orientated on a north-south axis such that the rear elevation generally faces west. The properties benefit from reasonably sized rear gardens which back onto corresponding rear gardens. Accordingly, there is a reasonable sense of openness in the rear outlook of these dwellings.
6. Both adjoining properties to No.20 have single storey rear extensions which have been built to the property boundaries such that the original rear elevation of No.20 is now enclosed at ground floor level. The appeal proposal would infill this space and modestly project beyond the rear elevations of the adjoining extensions by just over 1 metre. A comparable eaves height and a relatively shallow roof pitch would check the scale of the profile of the extension where it projects beyond the neighbouring building lines. Whilst the appeal proposal would occupy the width of the plot, the nearest ground floor openings on adjoining properties are set in a short distance from the boundary. Accordingly, in the outlook from both adjoining properties the proposed extension would not appear as either dominant or intrusive.
7. No.22 Park Close is positioned to the north of the appeal property with two ground floor windows on the rear extension facing west. Whilst the appeal proposal would be obliquely visible from the nearest window the outlook from this opening would remain principally over the open rear garden and the wider sense of openness from being a corner property. Given the limited projection beyond the rear building line of No.22 and the modest height of the extension I do not consider that the appeal proposal would unacceptably reduce light levels for the occupants of No.22 or shade any notable area of the rear garden to this property.
8. When experienced against the massing of the two storey row containing the host dwelling and in the context of the reasonably sized rear gardens the proposed extension would not appear as an incongruously large addition. I accept that the changing roof profile from shallow pitch to flat would result in an awkward appearance. This would be moderated, however, by its position between the flat roof extension of No.22 and the pitched profile to the new extension at No.18. As such the roof design would sit within variety already to be found on the rear elevation of this row of houses and as such it would not appear particularly harmful.
9. I therefore conclude that the appeal proposal would not result in any significant harm to the living conditions at neighbouring properties in terms of outlook and daylight levels or to the character of the host property and surrounding area. It would therefore accord with the design objectives and amenity considerations of Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030. These policies seek, amongst other things, to enhance environmental quality, secure high quality design and minimize overbearingness. The proposal would therefore be consistent with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to secure high

quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing occupants of buildings.

10. Reference has also been made to the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Residential Extension Guidelines adopted in 2003 which Local Plan policy seeks to implement, notably at Policy SC7. Whilst I appreciate the appeal proposal would be at variance with the specific technical measurements in this SPG I have nonetheless found that the particular circumstances at the appeal location means there would be no significant harm in relation to the two main issues identified. In my view the appeal proposal would accord with the intent of the SPG.

Other Matters

11. I note that the proposed extension would require construction at the property boundary. Such matters are dealt with under separate legislation (the Party Wall Act) and as such are not before me.

Conclusion and Conditions

12. For the reasons set out above, and having considered all other matters before me, I conclude that the appeal should succeed. I have imposed the standard time limit condition as well as a condition that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. These are considered necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I also consider a condition controlling the external materials and finishes to the extension to match the existing dwelling necessary in the interests of local character and appearance.

David Spencer

Inspector.