
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2020

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/20/3258549
165 Boston Manor Road, Brentford TW8 9LE

- 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 Nick Harte against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00133/165(GF)/P1, dated 29 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey rear extension at 165 Boston Manor Road, Brentford TW8 9LE, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00133/165(GF)/P1, dated 29 April 2020, subject to the conditions below;
 - 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: Proposed Plan Drawing 89/02; Existing Ground Floor Plan Drawing 89/01; Elevations Drawing 89/04; Proposed Roof Plan Drawing 89/03; 1:500 scale plan; and 1:1250 scale plan.
 - 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.

Main Issues

2. The main issues of the appeal are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - The character and appearance of the area; and
 - The living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent properties, with particular regard to outlook, daylight and sunlight.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The proposed single storey extension would project further from the rear elevation of the appeal property than those either side and the distance given

in the SPD¹. Nevertheless, there is a varied appearance to the rear elevations of the properties along this part of Boston Manor Road. Many have been altered or extended, including ground floor rear projections. There is no consistency to the depth, height, roof form and appearance of these projections, some of which extend a similar distance from the 2-storey element of the buildings as the appeal scheme would.

4. The proposed extension would be set below the first-floor windows and be a comparable height to the flat roof projection at 167 Boston Manor Road (No 167). In addition, it would be lower than the pitched roof extension at 163 Boston Manor Road (No 163). Moreover, the depth of the proposed extension would not project excessively beyond the adjacent built form. As a result, it would appear subordinate to the existing building.
5. The existing extensions either side, boundary treatments and outbuildings in the rear gardens of the row would largely screen the proposal in views from nearby properties. The scheme would be even less visible in views along the lane behind the site and from other public vantage points.
6. The Grand Union Canal Conservation Area (CA) is located near the application site. The significance of the CA lies, in part, in the development along and association with the canal itself. As the proposal is located on the rear of the appeal building and would have limited, if any presence in views to or from the CA, it would have a neutral effect on the CA.
7. Consequently, the proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would accord with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (Local Plan). These, in part, require developments to maintain and conserve the character of the area. While it would breach the depth for such extensions set out in the SPD, the scheme would comply with its aims to ensure extensions are secondary to the original house and subservient to the host dwelling.

Living Conditions

8. Although projecting beyond the maximum depth outlined in the SPD and filling the whole width of the site, the proposal would not extend considerably beyond the existing built form at the adjacent properties. Furthermore, it would be a comparable height to the projection at No 167 and lower than that at No 163.
9. The rear elevation windows at the adjacent properties are orientated towards their rear gardens and there would only be angled views towards the appeal scheme. Moreover, there is extensive glazing on the end elevations of both No 163 and No 167 giving a wide outlook from those rooms. Consequently, the proposed extension would not be an overbearing and imposing feature in the outlook from the neighbouring properties.
10. The impact on sunlight from the extension on the adjacent properties would be limited to the early morning, if at all, given the course of the sun, orientation of the buildings and therefore the direction of shadowing. The position and size of the extensive rear elevation glazing on the single storey projections either side of the appeal site would allow sufficient daylight to reach these rooms. Therefore, the proposal would maintain a reasonable relationship with the

¹ Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document

neighbouring properties and would not result in excessive loss of daylight or sunlight.

11. As such, the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent properties with regard to outlook, daylight and sunlight. It would accord with Policies CC2 and SC7 of the Local Plan where they require developments to not result in harm to the amenity of neighbouring residents and create liveable spaces.
12. Despite a technical breach of the SPD, the scheme would accord with its aim to prevent schemes that cause unacceptable enclosure and block daylight and sunlight received by neighbours.

Other Matters

13. Third party comments have referred to the strength and quality specifications of the roof and a replacement balcony. I have assessed the scheme on the basis of the submitted plans and the description given on the application form. The Council have not raised concerns over these matters. From the evidence I have been presented with I have reached the same finding.

Conditions

14. In addition to the standard time limit condition, in the interests of certainty, a condition specifying the approved plans is required. To protect the character and appearance of the area, a condition requiring the external materials to match that of the existing property is imposed. Given the scale of the proposal, it has not been demonstrated that a condition restricting the hours of construction is necessary.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that subject to conditions, the appeal should be allowed.

Mr Stuart Willis MSc, BA (Hons), PGCE, MRTPI

INSPECTOR