
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2018

by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th February 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3181983

11 College Road, Isleworth TW7 5DJ

- 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 Jonathon Swaine against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00294/11/P4, dated 23 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as demolition of a single-storey adjoining annex (circa 1980) and erection of a single-storey adjoining annex to same footprint, additional 3.65 m single-storey extension to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of a single-storey adjoining annex (circa 1980) and erection of a single-storey adjoining annex to same footprint, and additional 3.65 m single-storey extension to rear at 11 College Road, Isleworth TW7 5DJ in accordance with the terms of application Ref 00294/11/P4, dated 23 May 2017 and in accordance with 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: site location plan, Drawing nos FP 11, FP 12, FP 13, FP 14,
 - 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.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council requested that I view the proposal from the rear of No 13. I was unable to do this as there was nobody home at the time of my site visit. I was however able to assess the impact of the proposal by viewing No 13 from the bottom of the garden at No 11 over the garden wall. It was therefore not necessary for me to enter No 13.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 13 College Road, having particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

4. The host property is semi-detached with No 13 College Road. No 11 has a glazed addition to the rear adjoining the party boundary with No 13. It appears that No 13 had a similar addition once, but this is no longer present. As such the rear elevation of No 13 closest to No 11, is set back from that of No 11.
5. The new extension would be L shaped with the side infill extension constructed close to the party boundary with No 13. The submitted drawings indicate that the part of the extension closest to No 13 would extend 3.65 metres beyond the existing glazed extension. The Council has calculated that it would extend 5.3 metres beyond the rear elevation of No 13. It would have a flat roof and would be 2.5 metres in height.
6. No 13 has a long rear garden. The outlook from the rear windows of this property is over this area and is largely open. Whilst the new extension would be taller than the tall boundary fence between No 11 and No 13, it would not protrude significantly above it. Although it would be visible from the rear windows and garden to No 13, I consider that because of its height, depth and design that it would not be intrusive or overbearing on the outlook from the rear windows of No 13, including the living room at ground floor, or from its garden. For the same reasons, I find that it would not have an enclosing effect on the rear of No 13. The open outlook experienced from the rear of No 13 would be maintained.
7. The Council has expressed concern that the proposal would result in a loss of light to No 13, however has not provided substantive evidence to demonstrate this. Whilst the infill extension would be located to the south of No 13, its limited height and overall size would be unlikely to have an adverse effect upon levels of light reaching the rear of No 13 to the degree that would result in a change or harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of this property.
8. In light of the foregoing, I conclude that the proposal would not adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of No 13 College Road. There would therefore be no conflict with the amenity aims of Policy SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan (LP), the amenity and design aims of LP Policy CC2, and the context and character aims of LP Policy CC1. Furthermore, there would be no conflict with the intent of the Residential Extension Guidelines.

Other Matters

9. The appeal site is located within the Spring Grove Conservation Area. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. In this respect national policy on heritage assets, which includes conservation areas, is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. At paragraph 131, it sets out matters which should be taken into account including sustaining and enhancing the significance of the heritage asset and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
10. The new extension would be located on the rear of this attractive property. Its scale and design would respect the character and appearance of the host property and the conservation area in general. In light of the above, I find that the

proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. Harm to the significance of this heritage asset would not result. It is noteworthy that the Council reached a similar conclusion in this regard.

Conditions

11. The Council has suggested a number of conditions that it would wish to see imposed in the event that the appeal was successful. To ensure that the development is constructed as approved, a condition is necessary referring to the approved drawings. In the interests of the character and appearance of the host property and conservation area, a condition is necessary controlling external materials.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

R C Kirby

INSPECTOR