
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 April 2024

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/24/3337454

90 Cromwell Road, Hounslow, Middlesex TW3 3QJ

- 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 Reza Aboutalebi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application, Ref. 00323/90/P1, dated 6 November 2023 was refused by notice dated 4 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear extension and new window opening on the side elevation at first floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear extension and new window opening on the side elevation at first floor level at 90 Cromwell Road, Hounslow in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 00323/90/P1, dated 6 November 2023, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development to which this permission relates shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this Decision;
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted (other than the flat roof) shall match those used in the existing building;
 - 3) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. (PL2/SM3234) -00; -01; - 02; - 03; -04; - 05.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are (i) the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the host property, and (ii) the effect on the living conditions for adjoining occupiers at No. 88 as regards outlook and light.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that the appeal dwelling is one half of a semi-detached pair with No. 88 and that the latter has a large side extension which flanks Albion Road at its junction with Cromwell Road.
-

4. As regards issue (i), the Council's concern is that the flat roof of the first floor addition would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host building and with its elevated position would be normally expected to have a pitched roof. Whilst not disagreeing with this opinion I consider that there are mitigating circumstances in this instance, as set out in the grounds of appeal.
5. Firstly, the size of the proposed extension is small, with the external measurements at just 2.2m depth and 2.6m width. And whilst there would be some views of the addition from Albion Road (albeit at some distance due to the wide plot of No. 88 and at an oblique angle), the eye would continue to be drawn to the appearance of the full width and height roof extension that already dominates the building (excluding the dwelling's outrigger 'shared' with No. 88). Compared to the adverse impact that this extension already has on the building, the appeal scheme would to all intents and purposes be inconsequential. This is especially as it would be seen in the context of existing extensive single storey flat roofs at the rear of both Nos. 90 and 88.
6. Secondly, because the outrigger to No. 90 is half of a gable, unless a proposal were to include an extension to No. 88 as a joint development, the construction of either a dual pitch or mono pitch roof would appear as an awkward addition that would not read comfortably with the existing building.
7. Furthermore, the appellant has drawn my attention to the Council's approval of a first floor rear addition with a flat roof to No. 100 Cromwell Road and to the fact that the character and appearance of the area has already been affected by similar extensions at Nos. 70, 72, 74 & 78 Cromwell Road as a result of permitted development.
8. Turning briefly to issue (ii) the adjoining window in the rear wall of the outrigger at No. 88 is to a bathroom. As this is not a habitable room the Council cannot reasonably argue that the appeal scheme would result in an unacceptable loss of outlook and light.
9. Overall, I conclude that in this particular case and for the reasons explained, there would not be an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of No. 90 Cromwell Road and its immediate surroundings and no harm would be caused to the living conditions for the occupiers of No. 88 as regards outlook and light. There would therefore also be no harmful conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 or with Government policy in Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 which seeks to ensure that development results in well-designed places.
10. I shall therefore allow the appeal. A condition requiring matching external materials will maintain visual amenity, whilst a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans will achieve certainty as to the development allowed and is in the interests of proper planning.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR