



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 September 2020

by Rachael Pipkin, BA (Hons), MPhil, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3252310

21 Wainwright Grove, Isleworth, TW7 7PU

- 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 Nuno Matias & Ms Elvia Nunes against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref: 01513/21/P1 dated 25 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single storey conservatory at rear of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a single storey conservatory at rear of the property at 21 Wainwright Grove, Isleworth, TW7 7PU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 01513/21/P1 dated 25 February 2020, 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 strict accordance with the following approved plans: 4336/PP/01, 4336/PP/02 and 4336/PP/03.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the living conditions of existing and future occupiers, with regard to external space; and
 - the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living conditions

3. Number 21 Wainwright Grove (No. 21) is a small two-storey terrace house with a small, north facing, rectangular rear garden. The proposed conservatory would extend from the rear elevation by 3 metres into the rear garden.

4. The proposed conservatory would extend to cover approximately a third of the garden leaving a small rectangular space indicated to be around 26 square metres. Whilst small, due to the garden's regular shape, occupiers would nevertheless be able to fully utilise the space for sitting out, hanging clothes out or outdoor play. Furthermore, due to the orientation of the garden, the area to be retained as outdoor space is not overshadowed by the host property and benefits from the most sunshine during the day.
5. The Council's Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (SPD) sets out that rear gardens should be at least equal to the footprint of the original dwelling. The existing garden falls below this space requirement and the proposed development would further reduce this. However, the area of garden that would be occupied by the proposed conservatory is shady and enclosed on one side by a similar length extension to 19 Wainwright Grove (No. 19). This makes the space feel dark and less useful or attractive for outdoor activities. For this reason, whilst the size of the garden space would be reduced, I do not find there would be a commensurate reduction in the quality of the space. I am therefore satisfied that there would not be a noticeable loss in the amount of useable outdoor space.
6. I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of existing or future occupiers, with regard to external space. It would therefore comply with Policies CC2 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015 (LP) which sets out that development proposals will be expected to have a positive affect and maintain the amenity of private garden spaces. It would also accord with the SPD which seeks the retention of a high quality of useable amenity space.

Character and appearance

7. No. 21 forms part of a short terrace characterised by small houses with small rear gardens enclosed by high fences. Other properties within the terrace have ground floor extensions including No. 19 directly adjacent, whilst 22 Wainwright Grove has a sizeable outbuilding within its rear garden.
8. The proposed extension would reduce the size of the garden. However, this would not be dissimilar to the reduction in garden size to neighbouring properties. As such, the garden would not appear abnormally short in the context of surrounding development. Furthermore, the proposed development and consequent reduction in garden size would only be visible from the upper windows of surrounding properties. It would not therefore be visible from the public realm.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore comply with Policies CC2 and SC7 of the LP which together seek development that responds to the characteristics of the site, functions well and maintains the character of private spaces.

Conditions

10. The Council has suggested a number of conditions which I have considered against advice in the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. A condition specifying the approved plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In the interests of character and appearance, I have imposed a condition requiring materials to match existing.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

Rachael Pipkin

INSPECTOR