



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2021

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/ F5540/D/21/3277377
6 Grove Road, Brentford TW8 9NT

- 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 Ms Ali-Adib against the decision of the Council of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00529/6/P1, dated 20 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is rear glazed extension (existing single storey extension and conservatory to be removed).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear glazed extension (existing single storey extension to be removed) at 6 Grove Road, Brentford TW8 9NT, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00529/6/P1, dated 20 January 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Unnumbered block plan, received by the Council on 29 January 2021, unnumbered location plan, received by the Council on 29 January 2021 and unnumbered proposed elevations, received by the Council on 02 March 2021.

Main Issues

2. The effect of the proposal upon the character appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and upon the living conditions of occupants of 5 Grove Road.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

3. No. 6 is a two-storey terraced dwelling with a two-storey rear outrigger located on Grove Road in Brentford. The property benefits from a flat roofed rear extension which is attached to the outrigger, with a conservatory alongside, in the void adjacent to No. 7. The surrounding area is characterised

predominantly by two-storey terraced dwellings with enclosed gardens, such that the rear is not visible from the public realm.

4. The proposed extension would project to a depth of 6 metres from the rear wall of the outrigger and span the almost the entire width of the host property, being set in from each side to enable retention of neighbouring boundary treatments. Although the scale of extension would be larger than the existing rear extension, the structure has been designed with a shallow roof which tapers to comparatively low side walls, when compared to the parapet wall of the existing structure. This would help to limit the apparent scale from surrounding gardens. Moreover, the property benefits from a decent sized rear garden and ample space would be retained between the extension and the outbuilding to the rear. Having regard to those factors and taking into account the scale of the extension in comparison to the scale of the dwelling, the proposal would not amount to overdevelopment, nor would it appear disproportionately large.
5. Accordingly, the carefully planned extension would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area and would accord with the aims and objectives of policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015-20303) (the LP) and the National Planning Policy Framework which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that all new development conserves and takes opportunities to enhance the character and quality of distinctive areas of the borough.

Living Conditions

6. The extension would attach to the existing two-storey outrigger and also extend to occupy the space of the existing infill between the host property and the side boundary with no.7 Grove Road, save for a small courtyard immediately to the rear of the rear wall of the dwelling. Guidance in the Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (the 'SPD') Guidance Note 2 Householder Extension Guide (the 'SPG') suggests that single storey rear extensions should not extend by more than 3.05 metres. The proposal would clearly extend beyond that amount.
7. However, the SPD represents guidance rather than fixed policy and it is necessary to apply that guidance in light of site-specific circumstances. In that regard, the Council is satisfied that the impact on No.7 would be acceptable having regard to the height of the existing boundary wall, the low eaves level of the extension and the orientation of the proposal. I concur with that assessment.
8. The low eaves level and shallow roof would also help to minimise the impact on No.5. In fact, the height of the wall along the boundary immediately to the rear of that property would be significantly lower than the parapet wall of the existing single storey extension. That reduction in height would lessen the sense of enclosure and improve the outlook from the rear facing ground floor window in the main wall of the dwelling, which appears to serve the main habitable room to the rear. The small ground floor extension to the rear of the outrigger at No.5 benefits from a rear door and quite a small window which provide limited outlook and would not be unduly affected by the increased length of the extension, particularly given that the eaves level would not be substantially higher than a typical two metre garden fence. Overall, any

impact arising as a result of the increased projection would be off-set by the reduced height along the boundary when compared to the existing extension.

9. In addition, since the decision on the appeal scheme was issued, the Council has confirmed that prior approval is not required in relation to a six metre rear extension which would effectively have the same impact on the occupants of No. 5 as the appeal proposal¹. If the appeal was dismissed, there seems to be a more than reasonable likelihood that the alternative scheme would be constructed and that fall-back position is a relevant material consideration of some weight.
10. However, regardless of that point, I find that the development would not have a materially harmful effect upon the living conditions of the occupiers of no. 5 for the reasons set out above. Whilst the proposal would conflict with guidance in the SPD, the site-specific circumstances are such that the depth of the proposal would not be unduly harmful. Accordingly, there would be no conflict with the objectives of policies CC2 and SC7 of the LP and the National Planning Policy Framework which seek amongst other things to ensure that new development provides a good standard of amenity for adjoining residents, taking account of outlook, overbearing impact, overshadowing, and levels of sunlight and daylight.

Other Matters

11. I note comments from interested parties with regard to matters of construction in relation to the impact on party walls and fences. Such matters are effectively private matters covered by The Party Wall Act and fall outside of the consideration of this appeal.

Conditions

12. In addition to the statutory commencement condition, the Council have suggested that conditions are imposed to ensure that the development is constructed in matching materials to the main house and in accordance with the submitted plans. Those conditions are necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area and for the avoidance of doubt.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, the proposal conforms to the relevant policies of the development plan and I shall allow the appeal, subject to the conditions set out.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR

¹ Ref: 00529/6/PA1