

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 April 2023

**by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC**

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

**Decision date: 20<sup>th</sup> April 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/23/3316261**  
**58 Shelley Crescent, Hounslow, TW5 9BJ**

- 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 S. Singh Dhami against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
  - The application Ref 01010/58/P5, dated 15 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 January 2023.
  - The development proposed is retention of glass canopy to the rear elevation of dwelling house.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for retention of glass canopy to the rear elevation of dwelling house at 58 Shelley Crescent, Hounslow, TW5 9BJ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 01010/58/P5, dated 15 November 2022, and the plans submitted with it.

## Main issues

2. I consider that the main issues in this case are its effect on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of residents.

## Reasons

3. 58 Shelley Crescent is a two storey semi detached house in an established residential area. It has an existing single storey rear extension permitted in 2020 and a full width flat roofed dormer. The glass canopy the subject of this appeal has already been constructed. The surrounding area is fairly densely built up and many of the neighbouring properties have been extended in a wide variety of ways, particularly at the rear where there are numerous large roof dormers, single storey extensions and outbuildings.
4. The main policies relevant in this case include CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (the local plan) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extension Guidelines 2017 (the SPD). Policies CC1 and CC2 relate, among other things, to design matters and seek to enhance the quality of areas and to protect the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties to new development. Policy SC7 focuses on residential extensions in general terms regarding their design and impact on neighbouring residents and the SPD sets out more detailed guidance in respect of size and scale.

5. The canopy is a glazed structure with a metal frame attached to the full width of the rear extension and open on the three remaining sides. It extends approximately 4m beyond the earlier rear extension. The cumulative depth of the canopy and the extension exceeds what would normally be acceptable for semi detached houses as set out in the SPD, which includes conservatories and pergolas in the calculation. However, the SPD seeks to ensure that there is a balance between good quality design, protecting the neighbours' interests in terms of aspects such as overshadowing and enclosure and the expectations of homeowners to increase their accommodation.
6. The canopy is relatively large and appears so mainly because of its pitched roof and black metalwork. However, the open sides and the fully glazed roof supported on three slim uprights mitigate its impact on the appearance of the building as a whole. In the context of the many varied extensions and alterations to the rear elevations of No. 58 itself and the surrounding properties and the number of large separate outbuildings, it does not appear out of place in size or proportion. It is visible from the rear windows of nearby properties but not from the street or any other public viewpoint.
7. I conclude that it does not harm the character and appearance of the local area or the street scene and in this respect it is consistent with local plan policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 and the advice in the SPD.
8. I consider that the canopy has a very limited impact on the outlook from the properties on either side. There is a high fence on the boundary with No. 60 and a high brick wall on the boundary with No. 56 which limit the outlook from the windows of those properties, especially at No. 60 which has a small garden. These, together with a large outbuilding in the garden and a single storey rear extension at No. 56, similar to the earlier one at No. 58; and a single storey extension at No. 60, give a sense of enclosure to each of those gardens. The open, glazed nature of the canopy does not significantly increase this sense of enclosure. It does not result in a loss of sunlight or daylight to either No. 56 or No. 60.
9. I conclude that the development does not harm the living conditions of the neighbouring residents and in this respect it is consistent with local plan policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 and the advice in the SPD.
10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

### **Conditions**

11. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council. As the development has already been carried out these are not necessary.

*PAG Metcalfe*

INSPECTOR