



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 April 2021

by Rebecca Thomas MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3265604
24 Maple Grove, Brentford, TW8 8NJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Schedule 2, Part 1, Paragraph A.4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Muhibur Khan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00736/24/PA2, dated 12 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is Ground floor rear extension 5.80 metres deep, maximum height of 3.00 metres, 2.70 metres high to the eaves
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and approval is granted under the provisions of 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) for Ground floor rear extension 5.80 metres deep, maximum height of 3.00 metres, 2.70 metres high to the eaves at 24 Maple Grove, Brentford TW8 8NJ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00736/24/PA2, made on 12 October 2020 pursuant to Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, paragraph A.4(2), and subject to the following condition:
 - (1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, drawing numbers PL-1169-01 (Location/Block Plan); PL-1169-02 rev A (Ground Floor Plan/Elevations).

Procedural Matters

2. The Council altered the description of the development from *"to create open plan kitchen/dining/family area"* to *"Ground floor rear extension 5.80 metres deep, maximum height of 3.00 metres, 2.70 metres high to the eaves."* I consider this to be a more accurate description of the appeal proposals and I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.
3. The provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, Paragraph A.4 (7) require the local planning authority to assess the proposed development solely on the basis of its impact on the amenity of the adjoining premises, taking into account any representations received. Whilst the occupants of no. 25 Maple Grove have

made representations additional to amenity, my determination of this appeal has been made solely on the basis of amenity as required.

Main Issue

4. I consider the main issue in this appeal to be whether the proposed development would be granted planning permission by Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the General Permitted Development (England) Order 2015 as amended and the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of the occupiers of adjoining premises.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is an end of terrace dwelling, adjoining number 25 Maple Grove and the remainder of the terrace. The properties are separated by a low brick wall with close boarded timber fence above. The host site has a paved area with the proposed extension to be located over most of this paved patio area. The proposed extension, which would have a flat roof with parapets to the sides and two rooflights, would form part of the boundary with no. 25 and is proposed to extend 5.8m along this boundary, with a height of 3m to the highest point of the parapet wall. The existing boundary fence and wall extend to a height of 2.7m. Whilst there would be an increase in height at the boundary where the proposed development would be located, I consider that this is a minimal projection above the existing arrangements along the boundary. Given the proposed development is to be a flat roof, there would not be a significant overbearing or enclosing effect on no. 25. Whilst the proposed extension would be visible from no. 25, given its location to one side, the principal outlook from no. 25 down its rear garden would not be significantly impacted. Taking into account the scale and height of the proposed development I am satisfied that there would not be a substantive change in light/sunlight reaching the garden of no. 25. As such, I conclude that the proposed scheme would not cause harm to the amenities of the occupants of no. 25 Maple Grove.
6. The neighbouring property at no. 23 Maple Grove is not attached to the appeal property, although the gardens are adjoining. I noted at my site visit that no. 23 is set on higher ground to that of the appeal site. Given the changes in ground levels, and the form and siting of the proposed extension, the impact to the occupants of this property would be very limited.
7. Notwithstanding that the proposal would not conform with the size allowances as set out in the Council's adopted Residential Extension Guidelines¹, I consider that the proposal would not conflict with Local Plan² Policy SC7 (Residential Extensions and Alterations) which expects extensions to residential dwellings to (amongst other things) minimise harm to neighbouring residents. In addition there would also be no conflict with national planning policy which seeks to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjacent properties.
8. The proposals would thus also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which requires development to be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character to create high quality buildings and spaces.

¹ London Borough of Hounslow – Residential Extension Guidelines (Supplementary Planning Document) (December 2017)

² London Borough of Hounslow – Local Plan 2015-2030 (September 2015)

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, the proposal complies with the requirements of the GPDO. Accordingly, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Rebecca Thomas

INSPECTOR