



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2017

by Geoff Underwood BA(Hons) PGDip(Urb Cons) MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 23 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3178974
16 Grainger Road, Isleworth TW7 6PQ

- 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 Daniel McCrory against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00496/16/P1, dated 20 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is a ground floor rear side return and wraparound extension. The extension will have pitched and part flat roof with velux windows and flat roof window installed.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a ground floor rear side return and wraparound extension. The extension will have pitched and part flat roof with velux windows and flat roof window installed at 16 Grainger Road, Isleworth TW7 6PQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00496/16/P1, dated 20 February 2017, 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 and Block/Site Plan (dated 16 February 2017), Drawing 1, Drawing 2, Drawing 3, Drawing 4, Drawing 5, Drawing 6 and Drawing 7 (dated 16 March 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.

Main Issues

2. The main issues raised by this appeal are the effects the development would have on the living conditions of the occupiers of 18 Grainger Road, with particular reference to outlook and sense of enclosure, and on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

Reasons

Living conditions

3. The appeal property is a terraced house with an existing two storey outrigger to the rear attached to the gable end of which is a modest lean to conservatory. The neighbouring property at 18 Grainger Road has a similar two storey outrigger, an arrangement which creates a narrow gap between the two properties divided by a boundary fence. Ground floor windows to habitable rooms in the rear elevation and the outrigger at No 18 look out into this narrow space. Consequently, the two properties have a sensitive relationship to one another.
4. The appeal proposal would add a single storey extension which would project farther into the garden than the existing conservatory, fill in that part of the gap between the outrigger and the boundary with No 18 and extend 7m (according to the Council's figures) along that boundary.
5. The current outlook from adjacent ground floor windows of No 18 will be restricted by the boundary fence and the two storey mass of No 16's outrigger beyond, and occupiers will already experience a degree of enclosure as a result. That part of the extension adjacent to the boundary would have eaves of 2m and a pitched roof sloping away from the boundary. However this would have the effect of somewhat increasing the sense of enclosure and erode what spaciousness there is in the area immediately outside No 18's rear and flank ground floor windows, creating a narrower field of view as a result of the length of the extension along the boundary.
6. This would have a moderately harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 18 albeit that the increased sense of enclosure and reduced outlook would only be to a limited degree.
7. Nevertheless, the proposal would not accord with the Council's guidance¹ for rear extensions as a result of its wraparound configuration and greater than 3.05m length. Nor would it accord with criterion (f) of Local Plan² (LP) Policy SC7 or criterion (t) of LP Policy CC2. LP Policy's CC1 context and character requirements are less pertinent to this issue.
8. However, the appellant has drawn my attention to an alternative scheme which has the benefit of a Lawful Development Certificate and which he intends to implement should this appeal fail. On this basis I consider that there is a greater than theoretical possibility that such a 'fallback' scheme could take place. That scheme would include a shorter but taller extension running along the boundary with No 18. Due to its proximity and height it would be likely to have a more significant and harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 18 as a result of the greater degree of enclosure immediately outside and opposite the aforementioned ground floor windows.
9. Therefore, although longer than the fallback scheme, the low eaves height and pitch sloping away from the party boundary would mean that the appeal proposal would have notably less harmful effect on the neighbours' living conditions. That part of the proposed extension farther away from the rear elevation of No 18 would be adjacent to No 18's garden rather than its

¹ London Borough of Hounslow Residential Extension Guidelines, 2003.

² London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030.

outrigger and would have a less marked effect on the outlook from windows in the property.

10. This is a consideration which carries considerable weight and as such would outweigh the limited harm which the appeal scheme would give rise to. It is a consideration which indicates that permission should be granted other than in accordance with the development plan in this case.

Character and appearance

11. The appeal property is set within an area of predominantly terraced houses where the arrangement of streets means that their rear aspects are not readily seen except where terraces meet perpendicular streets. This is not the situation of the appeal property but the rear elevations at first floor and roof level of properties are visible from the adjacent St John's Gardens public park.
12. The wraparound nature of the extension would change the ground floor plan from its existing 'L-shape'. This existing layout is typical of many terraced houses and the Council have not indicated that the plan form of properties on Grainger Road, including the appeal property, have any significance beyond reflecting the staggered shape of an early or original built form and that this has been maintained in the particular block of properties. I note that whilst the Council's guidance recommends avoiding wraparound infill extensions in these circumstances the reasons for this relate to effects on neighbours' living conditions.
13. The change to the ground floor plan, and its relationship to any existing building lines to the rear, would not be perceptible other than at close quarters and the extension is unlikely to be visible from the public park at the rear of the site due to intervening boundary treatments, outbuildings and vegetation. Furthermore, the original plan form to the rear would remain evident above ground floor level.
14. Consequently I do not consider that the proposal would materially harm the character or appearance of the host building or the area. Whilst the proposal would not accord with the Council's guidance, it would not conflict with the various criteria of LP Policies CC1 or CC2 in this respect.

Conditions

15. It is necessary to specify the approved drawings as this provides certainty. It is necessary to require materials to match to preserve the character and appearance of the property and the area.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons set out above, the development would not materially harm the character and appearance of the property or the area and, whilst it would give rise to moderate harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings, this would be outweighed by other considerations. The development accords with the development plan except where material considerations have indicated otherwise and the appeal is therefore allowed.

Geoff Underwood

INSPECTOR