
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 December 2017

by Matthew Birkinshaw BA(Hons) Msc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22nd December 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3181874
20 York Road, Brentford, TW8 0QP

- 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 Marc Finnerty against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01244/20/P2, dated 7 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 23 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is a rear extension to existing outrigger with side return. Erection of new dormer to rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear extension to existing outrigger with side return and erection of new dormer to rear elevation at 20 York Road, Brentford, TW8 0QP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 01244/20/P2, dated 7 March 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 following approved plans: 2094 CTS 00 ZZ DR A 0201 Rev 02 and 2094 CTS 00 ZZ DR A 2301 Rev 02.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area; and
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 22 York Road, having particular regard to outlook, daylight and sunlight.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal relates to a 2-storey mid terrace property. At the rear is an outrigger and existing conservatory. As part of the proposal the conservatory
-

would be demolished for a new single storey extension with a pitched roof. The narrow gap in between the outrigger and the site boundary would also be infilled by a flat roof extension that would wrap around the enlarged kitchen.

4. The Council's *Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Guidance* ('SPG') advises that planning permission will normally be refused for extensions that infill the space adjacent to, and 'wrap around' rear projections. It also states that extensions should be secondary to the original house and seeks to limit single storey extensions beyond 3.05m at the rear of terraces. The appeal proposal would therefore be contrary to the Council's guidance.
5. However, the extension from the rear of the outrigger would replace the existing conservatory. Moreover, it would be viewed alongside the extension at no.18, which is also beyond the outrigger at ground floor level. Although the appeal scheme would protrude roughly 1m further into the garden, the final part of the extension would only be approximately 2m high and would have a flat roof. Due to its design the rear extension would therefore be a relatively modest addition, secondary in appearance to the original dwelling. It would also be viewed in the context of several other extensions which have been carried out at the rear of surrounding properties.
6. The infill extension would alter a defining characteristic of the property, and I am unaware of any similar alterations on York Road. Nevertheless, this part of the scheme would also have a flat roof and would only be roughly 2m high. As such, it would be a low key, subservient addition to the rear elevation. The size, scale and flat roof design would not materially harm the appearance of the host property. When viewed from the rear the form of the principal 2-storey outrigger and traditional character of the terrace would be maintained.
7. I therefore conclude that due to the size, scale and design of the scheme, and when viewed in the context of several other alterations at the rear of the terrace, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. As such, there is no conflict with Policy SC7 of the *London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan* which, amongst other things, requires residential extensions and alterations to complement the original building, harmonise with adjoining properties and maintain the character of the streetscene. There is also no conflict with Local Plan Policies CC1 or CC2 which are concerned with context and character and promoting high quality design, or the aims and objectives of the *Residential Extension Guidelines SPG*.

Living Conditions

8. The proposal would extend roughly 9.1m from the rear elevation adjacent to no.22. I therefore appreciate concerns regarding the potential tunnelling effect this could have and the increased sense of enclosure. However, the flat roof design of the infill extension would minimise its visual impact. At roughly 2m high it would also be only slightly higher than the existing boundary fence. Based on the evidence provided the extension would not be a visually imposing or dominating form of development from no.22.
9. It is also pertinent to consider that planning permission has already been granted for an extension with a similar relationship to the side and rear of no.22 (Ref 01244/20/P1). Although the approved scheme would only extend as far as the outrigger, the narrow gap adjacent to the shared boundary would be 'infilled' by new development. When taking this into account, and the

limited height and design of the proposal, I am not persuaded that it would give rise to any significantly greater impact on outlook or daylight.

10. Furthermore, due to the layout of houses on York Road the rear elevation of no.22 is orientated broadly north-west. Combined with the siting of the 2-storey outrigger at the host property, the ground floor rear-facing windows are therefore unlikely to receive any significant levels of direct sunlight at present. As a consequence, the appeal proposal would not give rise to any harmful overshadowing of adjacent windows. Due to its height and flat roof design there would be no harmful loss of sunlight within the adjoining rear garden either.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not cause any material harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 22 York Road having regard to outlook, sunlight or daylight. As a result, there is no conflict with Policy SC7 of the *London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan* which, amongst other things, seeks to minimise harm to neighbouring residents by avoiding an unacceptable loss of daylight, sunlight or outlook. For the same reasons there is also no conflict with Local Plan Policy CC2 which is concerned with promoting high quality design, or the aims and objectives of the *Residential Extension Guidelines SPG*.

Other Matters

12. The Council has not raised any concerns regarding the proposed roof alterations at the appeal property. Given the varied appearance along the rear of the terrace and similar extensions elsewhere I find no reasons to disagree.

Conclusion and Conditions

13. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.
14. Aside from the standard time limit condition it is necessary to list the approved plans, as this provides certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area a condition is also required to ensure that the materials used match the existing house.

Matthew Birkinshaw

INSPECTOR