
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2017

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3181306

2a Myrtle Road, Hounslow TW3 1QD

- 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 G Khan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00782/2A/P6, dated 18 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 20 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a single-storey rear extension at 2a Myrtle Road, Hounslow TW3 1QD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00782/2A/P6, dated 18 May 2017, 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 approved plans: 2AM-RD/PLAN/REV/01 (Existing Elevations), 2AM-RD/PLAN/REV/01 (Proposed Elevations), 2AMRD/PLAN/REV/06, 2AM-RD/PLAN/REV/004 (Existing Ground Floor Plan), 2AM-RD/PLAN/REV/004 (Proposed Floor Plan) Received 25/05/2017, Site Location Plan, Planning Statement dated May 2017 Received: 24/05/2017.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr G Khan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matters

3. There is a concurrent appeal on the same site for a scheme with a broadly similar description to this development (ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3177918) and which will be the subject of a separate decision.

4. Planning Permission has been granted at the appeal site for the conversion of the existing single storey garage into a habitable room use¹ and for a first floor side extension² and were both unimplemented at the time of my site visit. A Certificate of Lawfulness has also been issued for the erection of a single storey rear extension on the site in November 2016³.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property comprises of a detached two storey dwelling at No. 2a Myrtle Road (No. 2a) with single storey side and rear extensions and a rear roof dormer. The property is located on an infill plot at the end of a traditional terrace of two storey residential properties set back from the road with small enclosed rear gardens. It is situated at the rear of a two storey terrace of commercial properties at Nos 78 – 82 Kingsley Road with residential use above and single storey extensions and outbuildings at the rear.
7. The development involves the construction of single storey pitched roofed rear extension that would extend across the width of the house with a staggered design and would project out by approximately 3.9m from the rear elevation of the property. The appellant states that this proposed extension would be identical to the single storey rear extension issued with a Certificate of Lawfulness by the Council and as such is a material consideration to which I attach significant weight.
8. The single storey extension would be seen in the context of the single storey extensions and outbuildings at the rear of the properties on Kingsley Road and the single storey rear extension at the adjacent property at No. 2. Against this backdrop, the scale, form and siting of the extension would not look out of place or excessive in relation to the built form of the host property and the adjacent properties. The modest overall increase of the rear projection at No. 2a together with the use of matching materials and fenestrations would ensure that the development sits relatively unobtrusively against the two storey form of the main property. This would allow the development to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property and limit any significant adverse impacts on the street scene.
9. Although the Council states that the combined effect of the approved side garage conversion, first floor side extension and the proposed single storey rear extension would unbalance the proportions of the existing dwelling, I am satisfied that the extension would not be visible from the road at the front and in views from Kingsley Road public car park at the rear would appear to be visually subordinate. In any event, I am required to deal with this development on its own merits and, for the reasons set out, my decision does not turn on these matters.
10. I have considered the Council's comments regarding the use of the extended property as a family unit and the unauthorised extension resulting in

¹ 00667/R/078-82/P3

² 00782/2A/P4

³ 00782/2A/LAW1

inadequate private rear garden space and substandard living conditions. Due to the staggered design of the extension, this proposal would result in additional space being provided at the rear of the property in comparison to the current unauthorised rear extension. However, the Council has not referred me to any specific requirements or standards for the amount of amenity space required with this type of development and in the absence of the convincing evidence to the contrary, a generalised concern of this nature does not justify withholding permission on these grounds.

11. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It is consistent with the overall local character and design aims of Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015 and Section 1.0 of the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Guidance 2002. These policies and guidance, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development and extensions should be of a high quality design that complement and harmonise with the original building and adjoining properties, maintain the character of the streetscene and contribute to the character of the area.

Conditions

12. Having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular paragraph 206, I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have specified the approved plan as this provides certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition requiring that the external surfaces of the development match those of the existing property.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR