



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 April 2023

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15TH May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/23/3315002

53 Percy Road, Hounslow, Isleworth, TW7 7HD

- 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 Ralph Wilson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00878/53/P1, dated 20 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 29 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single-storey rear extension at 53 Percy Road, Hounslow, Isleworth, TW7 7HD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00878/53/P, dated 20 September 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 plans: Site Location Plan at scale 1:1250, Block Plan at scale 1:500, Drg No 2, Drg No 1-145 and the Fire Safety Layout Plan.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions at 55 Percy Road with regard to light and visual impact.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached, two-storey house within a residential street comprising tight knit semi-detached and terraced houses. The proposal is to erect a single-storey, flat roof extension to the rear across the full width of the property.
4. The Council's *Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document December 2017* (SPD) deals with single-storey rear extensions at section 4.3. In order to avoid causing unacceptable enclosure and loss of

daylight and sunlight received by neighbours, the SPD advises that single-storey rear extensions to semi-detached houses should not exceed a depth of 3.65m from the rear wall of the original house. The proposed extension would project 4m from the rear wall of the original house. This would exceed the guidelines within the SPD but not significantly so in my opinion.

5. During my visit I observed that No 55 is unextended to the rear but that there was an unusually tall enclosure along the common shared side boundary between both properties. This comprised a solid brick wall to a depth virtually equivalent to the depth of the proposed extension. The extension would rise to a height of 3m. Based upon my observations during my site visit it would not significantly exceed the height of the existing boundary enclosure.
6. Given the specific circumstances between Nos 53 and 55 Percy Road, my overall impression is that the additional height of the extension's flank wall above the existing boundary wall would not result in any significant increased loss of light to, or outlook from, the neighbours' rear facing living space. Although not determinative, I note also that there was no objection received by the Council to the planning application from the adjoining occupiers. Overall, I find no conflict with the aims and objectives of the SPD or with Policies CC1, CC2 or SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 as far as they seek to ensure that development minimises harm to neighbouring residents. Neither would it conflict with chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to achieve well-designed places.

Other Matters

7. The appeal site is located within a late-Victorian residential street within the Isleworth Riverside Conservation Area (CA). The Council consider the proposal to be of a subordinate scale and design sympathetic to the host dwelling. I concur. I am satisfied therefore that the character and appearance of the CA would be preserved.

Conditions

8. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans is necessary to provide certainty. In the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area a condition is required to ensure that the proposal is finished with materials to match the existing.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, I find that the proposal would not harm the living conditions at 55 Percy Road. Accordingly, in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR