



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2024 by N Unwin BSc (hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by A Price BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/24/3339439

3a York Parade, Great West Road, Brentford, Hounslow TW8 9AA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Roland Mahilaj against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is 01243/3A/P3.
 - The development proposed is described as extending the existing dining and kitchen area on the first floor at the rear of the property, to provide additional space for the residential unit, which includes internal and external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extending the existing dining and kitchen area on the first floor at the rear of the property, to provide additional space for the residential unit, which includes internal and external alterations at 3a York Parade, Great West Road, Brentford, Hounslow TW8 9AA in accordance with the terms of the application, ref. 01243/3A/P3, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 100.0; 200.2; 200.3; 300.2; and 300.3.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed of the materials specified within the application form.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The proposal is described within the decision notice as being a retrospective application. Nevertheless, there are variations between the submitted plans and the works I observed during my site visit. As such, I have determined this appeal on the basis of the submitted plans.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:

- the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and
- the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 2 York Parade and 4 York Parade, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site forms a mid-terraced property set over three floors. As with the appeal property, many of the rear elevations of properties comprising the terrace have undergone various extensions and alterations, including first floor rear extensions and dormers. When combined with the variations in the size and style of windows, the rear elevation of the terrace possesses a highly varied character.
6. The proposed first floor extension would project modestly to the rear, in line with the existing ground floor building line. This modest projection, combined with its proximity to the first floor rear extension of the adjoining property, would result in a form of development that would satisfactorily respond to the design of the host property and is reflective of the existing varied character of the wider terrace. The proposed windows would be similar in style, size, and position to others observed within the rear elevation of the wider terrace. Whilst the majority of those window frames are white, given the terrace's highly varied nature in other respects, the use of aluminium PPC finish windows and doors would not have an unacceptable effect on the character of the existing property or wider terrace.
7. Accordingly, the proposed development would comply with the relevant provisions of Policies SC7, CC1, and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (LP), which when read together require new development to respond to the original building and context and conserve an area's character.

Living Conditions

8. The first floor rear elevation of No. 2 contains a window and door and is recessed behind a small external terrace. The first floor of No. 4 has been extended, infilling the former external terrace, with its rear elevation containing two large window openings. A large open area comprising some low-level buildings is located to the rear of the terrace, affording an open aspect and good outlook from the first and second floor rear windows and external terraces.
9. While the proposed first floor extension would change the relationship between the appeal site and those neighbouring properties, it would project modestly beyond their existing rear elevations, limiting its impact when viewed from the rear windows and external terrace. Furthermore, the proposal would not impact the existing open area to the rear of the terrace and the good levels of outlook it affords these properties. Therefore, the proposal would not be overbearing or have an unacceptable impact on the outlook of the occupiers of Nos 2 or 4.

10. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would comply with the relevant provisions of LP Policies SC7 and CC2, which, in summary and amongst other requirements, require new development to avoid any unacceptable loss of outlook or sense of enclosure to neighbouring residents.

Conditions

11. Other than the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition requiring external materials to be in accordance with those specified within the application form is also necessary.
12. Given the restrictions to the permitted development rights of flats, any additional openings within the first-floor rear elevation would require planning consent. As such, a condition restricting additional rear openings within the first floor would be unnecessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, the proposed development would accord with the development plan, when taken as a whole, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

N Unwin

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

A Price

INSPECTOR