



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 February 2022

**by J Somers BSocSci (Planning) MA (HEC) MRTPI IHBC**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 16 February 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/21/3282122**

**Flat 1, 678 Great West Road, Isleworth TW7 4PU**

- 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 Sanjay Agarwal against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow.
  - The application Ref 00505/678(GFF)/P4, dated 23 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2021.
  - The development proposed is a single storey part rear infill extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey part rear infill extension; in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 00505/678(GFF)/P4, dated 23 March 2021, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings listed below:
    - Proposed Ground Floor Plan Proposed Elevations, Drawing No. PL/SM/3088-02
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the living conditions of current and future neighbouring residents of No.678A Great West Road as a result of access to light and outlook.

## Reasons

3. The appeal site is located along the northern side of Great West Road which consists of large two storey detached and semi-detached dwellings, where some of the dwellings such as the appeal site have been converted into apartments. The appeal property is located on the ground floor of the dwelling with its side wall forming an access for residents which runs from the front to the rear garden of the dwelling.
4. The dwelling immediately to the west of the accessway is No.678 Great West Road, which is a two storey detached dwelling which is setback approximately

one metre from the property boundary with the appeal site. The rear of the neighbouring dwelling at No. 678 has a single storey extension which has large full height windows to the rear and a smaller secondary window to the side of the extension which gives secondary light into the habitable room.

5. Policies CC2 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan (LP) are design related policies which seek to ensure that there is not an unacceptable loss in living conditions within proposed development. The Council has also adopted a Residential Extensions guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which provides further guidance and interpretation of planning policy with regards to appropriate design and development.
6. The proposed extension would be single storey and infill the built form at ground level so that a single storey extension would be constructed across the entire width of the existing building. The extension would be situated approximately 1 metre from the side boundary with No.678 with the main dispute between the parties is whether the proposed extension would cause an unacceptable loss of outlook and/or light. Whilst I have not been presented with any technical evidence (such as a daylight/sunlight assessment), based on the information before me and from what I saw on my site visit, it is clear to me that based upon the positioning, height and massing of the proposal; that the extension would lead to a loss of light and outlook from the present situation when compared to the proposed.
7. Whilst I consider there to be some loss of light and outlook, I am not convinced that the loss would be 'unacceptable' as per LP Policy CC2 and SC7, which are supported by the SPD. The setbacks of the proposed extension to the boundary, and the distance between the neighbouring window to the boundary; as well as the window in question to the side being a secondary window would enable the habitable room of the neighbouring No.678 to have a sufficient level of light and outlook not uncommon for dwellings in this particular location.
8. Taking the above into account, I disagree that the proposed rear extension would result in unacceptable harm to living conditions as a result of loss of outlook and access to light. Consequently, and in conclusion of this matter, the proposed scheme is made in accordance with LP Policies CC2 and SC7, which is accompanied by the SPD.
9. I note that LP Policy CC1 has been utilised in the reasons for refusal, which is a design led policy which is not relevant to the consideration of living conditions. The Council Officer's Report has stated that the design of the proposal is made in accordance with LP Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 and I have no reason to dispute this.

### **Conclusion and Conditions**

10. For these reasons, and having considered all matters raised in evidence and from what I saw during my site visit, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted, subject to the conditions as detailed previously.
11. The Council in their Appeal Form response detailed that should the appeal be allowed, that conditions regarding time limit, approved plans and materials which match the existing building be placed on any decision notice. I have considered the conditions as specified in the beginning of this letter in

accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). Conditions 1 and 2 are standard conditions which set the standard time limit and approved plans which are necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have not included existing plans within the approved plans condition as suggested by the Council as existing plans do not require approval. Condition 3 seeks that the scheme is constructed in matching materials which is necessary as this condition enables the development to fit in with the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the locality.

*J Somers*  
INSPECTOR