



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 23 February 2021

by R E Jones BSc (Hons), DipTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3264387
268 Great West Road, Hounslow TW5 0BJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, Paragraph A.4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr R Singh against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00505/268/PA1, dated 16 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 13 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and prior approval is granted under the provisions of Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) ("The GPDO") for a single storey rear extension, at 268 Great West Road, Hounslow TW5 0BJ, in accordance with the application Ref 00505/268/PA1, made on 16 October 2020, and the details submitted with it, including plan nos. 20/268/GWRH/101/A, 20/268/GWRH/102/A, 20/268/GWRH/103/A and 20/268/GWRH/104/A, pursuant to Schedule 2, Part 1, Paragraph A.4 (2) of The GPDO.

Background and Main Issue

2. The provisions of the GPDO, under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, Part A.4 (7) require the local planning authority to assess the proposed development solely on the basis of its impact on the amenity of any adjoining premises, where any adjoining occupier objects to the development. As adjoining neighbours objected to the application, the Council assessed the impact of the proposal and found it unacceptable.
3. The main issue is therefore the effect of the proposed extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 270 Great West Road (No 270), with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

4. The adjoining semi-detached dwelling (No 270) has a single storey flat roof addition extending from its main back wall. A large set of patio doors in that addition's rear elevation face the property's rear garden. The proposed extension would be built alongside the neighbouring addition and project some 1.3m beyond it. At around 3m in height the proposal would rise above the existing boundary fence between the two properties and be visible from the garden and the room served by the patio doors at No 270.

5. Although the proposed extension would be visible and sited close to No 270, its depth would not be excessive along the boundary, while its flat roof formation and single storey scale would not appear as a substantial structure from the nearest room and the garden at No 270. On this basis, the outlook of the neighbours at that property would not be materially harmed.
6. In terms of light, No 270's rear windows and garden face north and the proposed extension's scale and orientation in relation to the sun would result in only a very marginal depreciation of sunlight to the garden and ground floor rooms. Moreover, the open aspect to the rear of No 270 and the wide proportions of the patio doors serving its rear would ensure that ground floor rooms continue to receive adequate levels of daylight.
7. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document relating to residential extensions¹ (the SPD) seeks to limit the depth of extensions to semi-detached dwellings to 3.65 metres in order to protect the living conditions of neighbouring residents. The SPD goes on to explain that this is to prevent unacceptable enclosure and block daylight and sunlight received by neighbours. The proposal exceeds the depth from the rear wall of the original house, advised by the SPD. However, due to the presence of the rear addition at No 270, I find that the relationship between the proposed extension and the rear of the neighbouring property would be comparable to the relationship that is envisaged to be acceptable by the SPD.
8. Although not specifically referred to in the Council's decision notice I have also assessed the appeal proposal in relation to the semi-detached dwelling to the west, No 266. This property has its driveway and the wide side path relating to the appeal dwelling separating it from the proposed extension. No 266 also has an existing outbuilding partially occupying this gap. There are no windows in No 266's ground floor flank wall that would directly face the proposed extension, whilst the existing outbuilding would screen the proposal from No 266's rear facing windows and garden area. Therefore, I am satisfied there would be no material loss of outlook at this property. Furthermore, taking into account the proximity of existing structures close to the windows and garden of No 266, it is very unlikely that the proposal would significantly alter the level of light that property currently receives.
9. While there is no statutory requirement to determine the application in accordance with the development plan, in reaching my conclusions I have taken into account Policies CC2 and SC7 of the Core Strategy as well as the guidance in the Council's SPD referred to in the Decision Notice. Together these policies and guidance seek, among other things, to ensure that development protects the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Other Matters

10. There are concerns from third parties that the appellant would add a further storey of accommodation onto the proposed addition. However, the proposal before me does not include a first floor and I have assessed the scheme on the basis of it being a single storey extension only.

¹ Residential Extension Guidelines – Supplementary Planning Document – A Guide for Householders, adopted 20th December 2017

11. The issue relating to a blocked drain is a private matter for the respective occupiers to resolve and therefore does not form part of my consideration of this appeal.

Conditions

12. Although the Council have suggested conditions specifying the approved plans, any planning permission granted under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A is subject to the conditions in sections A.3 and A.4. This includes the submitted details with the application and therefore the formal decision includes within it reference to the approved plans.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not adversely impact on the living conditions of the occupants of No 270 with particular regard to outlook and light.

RE Jones

INSPECTOR