
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 September 2020

by James Taylor BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3255649
17 Renfrew Road, Hounslow TW4 7RB

- 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 Chaudry against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00934/17/P4, dated 30 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'first floor rear extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 'first floor rear extension' at 17 Renfrew Road, Hounslow TW4 7RB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00934/17/P4, dated 30 April 2020, 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: Location plan, Drawing Nos 5016-1, 5016-2, 5016-7, and 5016-8.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in materials to match the host building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on i) the living conditions of the occupiers of 15 Renfrew Road having particular regard to loss of light and outlook; and ii) the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living conditions

3. Policies SC7, CC1 and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 Volume One (LP) seek, amongst other aims, the provision of high-quality design that minimises harm to neighbouring residents. Pursuant to the objectives of the development plan, the London Borough of Hounslow, Residential Extension Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document, A Guide for Householders, Adopted 20 December 2017 (SPD) is a material consideration. Whilst the proposal would have a width and projection greater

than the SPD guidance at section 4.6, it would provide a separation to the shared boundary in excess of the minimum 2 metre distance recommended within the SPD. Moreover, it sets out that the acceptability of proposals depends on individual site circumstances.

4. The adjoining property of 15 Renfrew Road has a single-storey rear extension, the projection of which, ensures that reasonable outlook and light would be maintained at ground floor level without any overshadowing from the proposal. Furthermore, at first floor, the rear facing habitable room windows of No 15 are positioned, relative to the proposal, so as to maintain a 45-degree outlook to both sides. Given the separation distance and relative orientation, the proposal would ensure good access to daylight and sunlight with no undue sense of enclosure. As such, despite some technical conflict with parts of the SPD, the proposal would not be contrary to the objectives of the development plan.
5. Therefore, in conclusion on this main issue the proposal would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of 15 Renfrew Road having particular regard to loss of light and outlook. As such, the proposal would not conflict with Policies SC7, CC1 and CC2 of the LP. Amongst other aims these seek the provision of high-quality design that minimises harm to neighbouring residents.

Character and appearance

6. The proposed first-floor extension would be located to the rear of the property with no more than glimpsed views from Renfrew Road. To the rear, the proposal would be lower in height than and largely seen against the existing built form. Furthermore, it would have external materials and an eaves level to match the host building. Additionally, the area to the rear is in part characterised by additions, alterations and outbuildings. As such, the proposal would appear subordinate to the existing building in scale and mass with a design that would assimilate with the context.
7. Therefore, in conclusion on this main issue the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposal would not conflict with Policies SC7, CC1 and CC2 of the LP. Amongst other aims these seek the provision of high-quality design with extensions that complement the original building.

Other matters

8. In addition to the third-party concerns over living conditions they have raised issue over the existing rear extension crossing the boundary. However, this is beyond the planning merits of the proposal before me.

Conditions and Conclusion

9. The Council have suggested the standard implementation and approved plans conditions as well as a condition to require the use of matching materials. I find such conditions are necessary in the interests of defining the terms of the permission and to protect character and appearance.
10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

James Taylor

INSPECTOR