



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2023

by H Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/23/3315642

First Floor Flat, 9 Clements Place, Brentford TW8 9PS

- 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 Ahmed abouzeid against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00275/9/P3, dated 23 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear extension at 9 Clements Place, Brentford, TW8 9PS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00275/9/P3, dated 23 May 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, Site Plan, Existing & Proposed First Floor Plan, Proposed Section, TW8 1003/03, 9PS/1004, except in respect of the window shown in the side elevation of the extension on plan 9PS/1004.

Preliminary Matter

2. From my visit I saw that the extension has been constructed. The submitted Existing and Proposed First Floor Plan (dated 9/11/2020) and proposed elevation (9PS/1004) are inconsistent with the elevation showing a side window. I have requested amended plans, but they have not been forthcoming. On my visit I saw that there was no window in the side elevation of the extension, and I have proceeded on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the area, and
 - the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Clements Place is a cul de sac comprising semi-detached dwellings, with a variety of designs and set back from the highway. The host property is in use as two separate flats and has an existing single storey rear extension.

5. The guidance in the Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (SPD) states that rear extensions should be proportionate and subordinate to the dimensions of the main house and that they should be no greater than half the width of the original house.
6. The first floor extension does not meet the guidance in the SPD as it is greater than half the width of the main house. However, it remains as a subordinate extension to the house and is both narrower and shallower than the existing ground floor extension. In addition, the roof is lower than that on the host dwelling.
7. According to the evidence before me, the window in the rear elevation appears to be larger than the one it replaced. However, it is of a similar size to the first floor window in the adjoining semi-detached dwelling and therefore does not appear as an incongruous addition to the rear elevation.
8. The first floor rear extension does not harm the character and appearance of the area. It therefore complies with Policies SC7, CC1 and CC2 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 Volume One (2015) (Local Plan) which together, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development maintains the character of the area and that extensions are designed to be subordinate to the existing building.

Living Conditions

9. The first floor extension is set in approximately 1.5 metres from the shared boundary with 10 Clements Place. In this case, due to the orientation of the dwellings, the extension does not cause a loss of light or outlook to the neighbouring property.
10. The first floor rear extension does not harm the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers. It therefore complies in particular, with Policy SC7 of the Local Plan which, amongst other matters, seeks to ensure that development minimises harm to neighbouring residents.

Conditions

11. The Council has suggested that, in the event of the appeal being allowed, conditions regarding compliance with approved plans and matching materials should be imposed. However, as the development has been carried out the matching materials condition is not necessary. I have however, referred to the plans in the formal decision, apart from the side elevation window shown on the elevation plan (9PS/1004). As the development has already been completed, it is unnecessary to impose the standard condition relating to the commencement of development.

Conclusion

12. The proposal does not conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, which outweigh this finding. For the reasons given the appeal succeeds.

H Senior

INSPECTOR