



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2022 by M Long

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/21/3288029

13 Little Park Drive, Feltham TW13 5HY

- 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) Schedule 2, Part 1, Paragraph A.4 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Tamber against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00705/13/PA1, dated 11 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a 6.0 mts 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, Paragraph A.4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for a 6.0 mts single storey rear extension at 13 Little Park Drive, Feltham TW13 5HY in accordance with the application Ref 00705/13/PA1, dated 11 August 2021, and the details submitted with it including Drawing Nos. SD2142(P)11 and SD2142(P)13 and the location plan, pursuant to Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Paragraph A.4(2) of the GPDO.

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 GPDO (as amended), planning permission is granted for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse subject to limitations and conditions.
4. Paragraph A.4(7) to Part 1 requires the local authority to assess the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of all adjoining premises, taking into account any representations received. As an objection was received by the Council, they assessed the impact of the proposal on all adjoining neighbours. My consideration of this appeal has been made in the same manner.

Main Issue

5. I consider that the main issue in this appeal is the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of adjoining premises.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site is a semi-detached property with an existing single-storey rear extension that covers the width of the dwelling, and which has a depth of approximately 3.3 metres. The dwelling has a sizeable rear garden with an outbuilding and tall boundary walls. Its attached neighbour to the northwest, No. 15, also has a single-storey rear extension that projects to a very similar depth as the existing extension at the appeal property and is served by a large, glazed opening. No. 11, to the east, has a large outbuilding close to its rear elevation which is constructed against the shared boundary with the appeal site.
7. The proposal would include the demolition of part of the existing extension on the side closest to No. 11. The remaining part would be extended by approximately 2.7 metres, resulting in a total depth of 6 metres alongside the shared boundary with No. 15. The proposal would incorporate a flat roof.
8. While the total extension depth would be substantial, the proposal would only project approximately 2.7 metres beyond the extended rear elevation of No. 15. Moreover, the proposal would only extend a short distance above the existing tall boundary wall with its flat roof limiting its overall height. Therefore, the size of the extension would not appear overbearing or visually intrusive from the rear of No. 15 so would not result in a harmful reduction of outlook.
9. Given the orientation of the semi-detached pair, and the limited projection beyond No. 15's extended rear elevation, the proposal would not harmfully reduce the level of light available to the attached neighbour. I noted that there were large, glazed openings on the rear elevation at No. 15 which would continue to allow sufficient light to enter the property.
10. The Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (SPD) sets a maximum extension depth of 3.65m for extensions to semi-detached houses, to ensure extensions do not enclose or block light to the neighbouring property. While the proposal would exceed these requirements, it would only extend approximately 2.7 metres beyond the rear elevation at No. 15 and hence would ensure the aims of the SPD are met.
11. Due to the large setback of the extension from No. 11, and the existing outbuilding structure at this neighbouring property, there would be no harmful effect upon the level of light available to its residents. Given the distance of the proposal from adjoining neighbours to the rear, there would be no harmful impact upon the amenity of their occupiers either.
12. Overall, there would be no harmful impact on the amenity of the occupiers of any adjoining premises. The proposal would comply with Policies CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 Volume 1, adopted September 2015, which collectively, and amongst other matters, require proposals to provide adequate outlook, minimise overbearingness and overshadowing, and ensure satisfactory sunlight and daylight to adjacent dwellings.

Other Matters

13. Concerns have been raised in respect of the number of people who may occupy the extended appeal dwelling, their living conditions, the noise and waste produced as well as the impact upon local property prices. However, these

matters are not considerations listed within the GPDO to be taken into account when determining a prior approval application. There is also concern as to whether the extension would be built to match the proposed plans. This appeal decision only grants approval for the scheme proposed in the submitted details.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed and prior approval should be granted.

M Long

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR