



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 September 2021 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc MSc MIEMA
CEnv MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/ F5540/D/21/3272261

235 Wellington Road South, Hounslow TW4 5HQ

- 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 L Mayo against the decision of the Council of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01181/235/PA1, dated 8 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. Under 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), planning permission is granted for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse subject to limitations and conditions.
4. Where an application is made for a determination as to whether prior approval is required for development which exceeds the limits in paragraph A.1(f) but is allowed by paragraph A.1(g) to Part 1, Paragraph A.4(7) to Part 1 requires the local planning authority to assess the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of all adjoining premises, taking into account any representations received.

Main Issues

5. I consider that the main issue in this appeal is the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of adjoining premises with regard to outlook and overbearing impact.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. No. 235 is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling on Wellington Road South in Hounslow. It symmetrically adjoins no.233 which has a single-storey rear extension to the depth of 3.4 metres¹. This extension is of some vintage and would have been subject to different planning considerations. No.235 also had a small single-storey offshoot at the rear, depicted in the existing drawings². At the time of my visit to the site, this had been demolished and construction appeared to be ongoing. There is also a box dormer constructed at the rear which sits astride almost the full width of the roof.
7. The proposed extension would be at the full width of the host property with a height of 3 metres at its furthest point and would extend to a depth of 6 metres from the rear external wall. By virtue of its depth, scale and position the proposed extension would have an overbearing impact when viewed from rear windows of no.233 and when viewed from the garden immediately to the rear of the dwelling. Given orientation and the juxtaposition of the two properties, the proposed extension would have a negative effect upon outlook because of its depth, massing and proximity. Given its position, directly to the south of no.233 the substantial flank wall would result in overshadowing in the morning hours and would create a sense of enclosure for the habitable space.
8. The appellant contends that they consider the existing extension at no. 233 to have a greater impact on the appeal site than the proposal will have on this adjoining property. They suggest that this extension would serve as a buffer and the effective projection of the proposed extension past the existing neighbouring extension would only be approximately 2.4 metres which is far less than the depth recommended by London Borough of Hounslow's Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document A Guide for Householders (Adopted 20 December 2017) (the 'SPG').
9. However, the existing extension at no. 233 is unlikely to have had a greater effect given its position to the north of the appeal property. Furthermore, the SPG states that where adjoining neighbours have built extensions as 'Permitted Development' or without planning permission over four years ago, planning permission for an extension of similar depth might be given if it does not block light to neighbours. I am not aware of any local guidance that suggests that an existing extension can act as a buffer for a proposal that extends beyond its depth and an assessment will be required based on the specific circumstances of the site and proposal. In this case, for the reasons given, the degree of projection beyond the neighbouring extension, allied to the height of the proposal and its orientation, would result in harmful effects on the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. In the light of the above analysis, I conclude that the proposed single storey rear extension would have a materially harmful effect upon the amenity of the occupiers of no.233. In this respect the scheme would be unacceptable. As a consequence, I recommend that prior approval should not be granted and, therefore, that the appeal should be dismissed.

¹ 01181/233/LAW1

² DRG NO.- PA/235/P.03

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and on that basis, I agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR.