



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2022 by Ms S Maur

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/22/3304437

101 The Crossways, HOUNSLOW TW5 0JJ

- 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 Mr Ragmeet Singh Chopra against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00329/101/P2, dated 13 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 14 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is a part first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the proposed part first floor rear extension at 101 The Crossways, Hounslow TW5 0JJ. In accordance with the terms of application Ref 00329/101/P2, dated 13 April 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: 2022/048-05PA, 2022/048-03HH, 2022/048-04HH, 2022/048-06HH.
 3. 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.

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. I noted on my visit that works were being undertaken to the dwelling which included the provision of a flat roofed dormer window. These works are not shown on the plans submitted with the appeal. This appeal should be considered solely based on the plans provided.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers of No.99, with particular regard to light, outlook and whether there would be an increased sense of enclosure.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a semidetached, two storey dwelling with a hipped roof. It has a single storey rear extension. The dwellings in this immediate area have a staggered building line. The neighbouring property No.99 has an obscured glazed window which appears to serve a bathroom at first floor level near to the shared boundary with the appeal dwelling. The ground floor rear projection appears to be a porch structure with the main walls and windows of this property being set behind this. There is a modest gap between the appeal dwelling and No.99.
6. The proposal consists of a part first floor rear extension with a hipped roof which would be set well below the main ridgeline of the dwelling. The proposed extension would have a minimal projection and would appear subordinate to the ground floor extension.
7. The rear of the neighbouring dwelling is stepped forward from the appeal property. However, as the first-floor extension would be modest and offset, the effect of the development would be limited. In addition, as the closest first floor window is obscure glazed the impact on outlook would also be limited. The ground floor rear area, close to the proposed extension, appears to be a porch, this in itself would impact on light, outlook and enclosure when seen from the neighbouring house. In this context the appeal scheme would have a very limited impact on the ground floor area of the neighbouring dwelling.
8. The proposal would not fully align with the guidance in the Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2017). This states that a minimum distance of 2 metres should be set between the first-floor section of a proposal and the original side wall of a neighbouring property. However, the proposal would be offset and would be limited in depth and ridge height. Therefore, in this instance the proposal would be acceptable with regards to the effect on light and enclosure. The SPD is also only guidance and the introduction to this document states that every property is slightly different, and each application is taken on its own merits and it may mean that development that does not meet the guidelines may be acceptable due to the circumstances of the site.
9. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No.99. The proposal would accord with Policies CC2 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan (2015) which seeks development that minimises harm to the amenities of neighbouring residents by avoiding an unacceptable sense of enclosure, providing adequate outlook and ensuring sufficient sunlight and daylight to adjacent dwellings.
10. Policy CC1, referenced in the Council's reason for refusal, deals exclusively with the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area. It is not relevant to the living conditions of neighbouring residents. As such there would be no direct conflict with this Policy.

Conditions

11. I recommend the standard time condition and a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, to provide certainty. In addition, I recommend a condition to ensure that the external

materials of the extensions match those of the existing dwelling in the interests of the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the immediate area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Ms S Maur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Taylor

INSPECTOR