
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 April 2017

by D Boffin BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI Dip Bldg Cons (RICS) IHBC

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

Decision date: 19 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/16/3162788
30 Heston Road, Hounslow TW5 0QJ

- 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 Viridi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00600/30/P4, dated 9 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as "*replacement roof to outbuilding and approval of installation of bathroom facilities*".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for replacement roof to outbuilding and approval of installation of bathroom facilities to the existing outbuilding at 30 Heston Road, Hounslow TW5 0QJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00600/30/P4, dated 9 September 2016, subject to the following conditions:-
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, VIR1/1/1, VIR1/1/2, VIR1/1/3, VIR1/1/4.
 - 3) The outbuilding shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes incidental to the residential use of the dwelling known as 30 Heston Road, Hounslow, TW5 0QJ nor shall any bathroom or kitchen facilities, other than those shown on the approved plans, be installed into the outbuilding.
 - 4) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling known as 30 Heston Road, Hounslow, TW5 0QJ.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council have raised no objections to the proposed pitch roof and as it would be similar in scale and design to the roofs of the adjacent outbuildings I have no reason to dispute this. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character of the area and the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with regard to noise and disturbance.
-

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is semi-detached and is located within a mainly residential area. At the rear of the property there is a lean-to extension and conservatory, detached garage and a detached outbuilding at the furthest extent of the garden. I noted at my site that the adjacent properties have similar detached outbuildings in similar locations within their gardens.
5. The proposal is to install a toilet, hand basin and boiler within the outbuilding in connection with ancillary use linked to the main dwelling. These works require planning permission as the outbuilding is subject to a current Enforcement Notice in relation to its use as a non-incidental and self-contained residential unit. I noted at my site visit that the outbuilding is currently being used for domestic storage and that there appeared to be no existing bathroom and kitchen facilities within it.
6. Taking into account the planning history of the site and the current Enforcement Notice I can understand that there are concerns that the proposed facilities may lead to the outbuilding being used for primary living accommodation again. I acknowledge that there is no detailed evidence before me as to why the WC facilities and boiler are required. Nonetheless, they would be a useful facility in connection with an all year round ancillary domestic use as well as being generally useful in the garden area.
7. Furthermore, as the use would be ancillary and linked to that of the main dwelling it is reasonable to consider that it would be likely that the intensification of its use and the amount of comings and goings occurring as a result of the use would be limited. Moreover, the specific facilities to be installed in the building can be controlled by condition.
8. The appeal site is in an established residential area of moderate density and the adjacent dwellings have similar outbuildings. Thus the outbuilding's use and separation distances from neighbouring dwellings would be in keeping with its surroundings and would not introduce an unusually noisy development into an otherwise quiet area or significantly alter the character of the garden area.
9. Consequently, I consider that the proposed development would not materially alter the character of the garden or create a level of noise and disturbance that would have an adverse impact on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers. It follows that the proposal would comply with Policies CC1 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan (2015) and the Council's *Residential Extensions Guidelines* Supplementary Planning Guidance (2003) which, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development conserves an area's character and does not have any undue adverse impact on adjoining properties.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council against the requirements of the Planning Practice Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework. In the interests of conciseness and enforceability the wording of some of the conditions has been amended.
11. In order to provide certainty as to what has been permitted I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings. In the interests of character and appearance, it is necessary to impose a condition requiring matching materials. It is both necessary and relevant to impose a condition to ensure that the use

of the proposed development is ancillary to that of the host dwelling, in the interests of amenity.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, and taking account of all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

D. Boffin

INSPECTOR