



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 January 2020

by Anne Jordan BA (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21st January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/19/3240521

45 Percy Road, Isleworth, TW7 7HD

- 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 and Mrs G and K Pryor against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00878/45/P1, dated 19 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 45 Percy Road, Isleworth, TW7 7HD in accordance with application Ref 00878/45/P1, dated 19 August 2019 and the plans with it and subject to the following condition:
 1. No additional windows, doors or openings shall be formed within the west facing flank elevation of the single storey rear extension hereby approved.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council altered the description of development to "single storey rear extension". As this more accurately describes the proposal, I have also used this description. The extension is already in place and so the application is made retrospectively.

Main Issues

3. The main issues for the appeal are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area;
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of adjoining residential occupiers.

Reasons

4. Percy Road is a quiet residential street made up of predominantly terraced houses. Although the facades are largely uniform in appearance, many of the properties have been altered and extended to the rear, and this gives a varied appearance to the properties when viewed from the back gardens.
5. The appeal property has a moderately sized garden and the extension, which has already been erected, extends around 4 metres from the rear façade. This

leaves a modest but usable space for outdoor recreation, in keeping with the size of the property. The extension has a flat roof and spans the width of the property, with the large patio doors occupying most of the rear elevation. As a result the extension has a contemporary appearance, and although it is relatively large, when viewed against the host property from the rear, the matching materials and uncluttered appearance of the addition sits comfortably with the host dwelling. Furthermore, I noted on site that a number of other properties along the terrace had been altered at the rear, including the adjoining No 47, which had an extension of very similar proportions. As such, the extension did not look incongruous when viewed in the context of the wider terrace.

6. On the first matter I therefore conclude that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the area and would not conflict with policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (Local Plan) which together seek to maintain the character of the surrounding area and to secure development which functions well in itself and in its effect on surrounding areas. It would also not conflict with the Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) which has similar aims, or with the National Planning Policy Framework, (the Framework) which seeks development which is sympathetic to local character.

Living Conditions

7. The side elevation of the extension sits close to the site boundary. The adjoining No 43 has windows at ground floor level which face out onto the garden, including patio doors nearest the appeal site which serve a principal room within the dwelling. The Council have expressed concerns that the proximity and depth of the extension would have a detrimental effect on the living conditions of the neighbours. I noted on site that the extension measured around 3 metres in height, and so although it was located close to the boundary, the section which extended above the existing fence-line was not unduly high. Due to the otherwise open aspect to the rear, the depth of the extension would also not be likely to be perceived as overbearing.
8. Furthermore, the size and position of the window patio doors to the adjoining property would be adequate to allow light into the property and would not be unduly overshadowed by the adjoining extension. Whilst the extension would have the potential to reduce morning sun to part of the garden, taking into account the overall size of available outdoor space, I am satisfied that this would not unduly diminish the usability of the garden.
9. On the second matter I therefore conclude that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of adjoining occupiers, and so would not conflict with policies SC7 or CC2 of the Local Plan, which together seek to protect the amenity of residential occupiers. It would also not conflict with the SPG or the Framework, which also have similar aims.

Conclusion and Conditions

10. The proposal would not harm the living conditions of adjoining occupiers and would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed. As the development has been completed, the conditions put forward by the

Council, relating to the time period for construction, the approved plans are matching materials are not necessary.

11. The Council have also suggested that a condition preventing the insertion of additional windows on the extension is necessary. Although the flank elevation to No 47 looks onto the side wall of that property, any additional high level windows on the elevation facing 43 would lead to a perception of overlooking, which would harm the living conditions of adjoining occupiers. A condition restricting the insertion of windows in this elevation is therefore reasonable and necessary.

Anne Jordan

INSPECTOR