



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2025

by **C Rafferty LLB(Hons), Solicitor**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/24/3345752

82 Greencroft Road, Hounslow TW5 0BH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ganesh Krishnamoorthy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is 00515/82/PA2.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey rear extension 6m deep with eaves height 2.10m and ridge height 3.37m.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (the GPDO), planning permission is granted for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse subject to limitations and conditions.
3. Part 1 Class A, paragraph A.4(7) of the GPDO has been triggered by the objection received from a neighbouring occupier. Paragraph A.4(7) confirms that, where any owner or occupier of any adjoining premises objects to the proposed development, the prior approval of the local planning authority is required as to the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of any adjoining premises.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of No. 80 Greencroft Road, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

5. The site is a semi-detached property on Greencroft Road, bounded on one side by the adjoining property of No. 80 and on the other by the property of No. 84. The proposal relates to a ground floor rear extension at the site, which would measure 6m in depth and 3.37m in height, with an eaves height of 2.10m.
6. Due to the ground floor rear projection at No. 84 Greencroft Road and the separation of this dwelling from the site, the proposal would not adversely affect the living conditions of residents at No. 84. However, No. 80 adjoins the appeal property and, at present, does not feature any such rear projections.

7. The Council refers to the Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document. This suggests that, to prevent unacceptable enclosure, single storey rear extensions on semi-detached properties should not exceed 3.65m. It continues that where extensions exceed the recommended depth the eaves of the extension on the side boundary should not exceed two metres high. However, the principle of development has been established through the GPDO, and I note the provisions of paragraph A.1(g) of the relevant part of the GPDO in this regard.
8. Nevertheless, the proposal would introduce additional bulk immediately adjacent to a sizeable part of the boundary with No. 80. Despite its hipped roof, due to its overall height it would rise above the boundary fencing and planting present. As such, its uppermost part would remain readily visible from the neighbouring garden. From this location, it would read as built form that, despite sloping away from No. 80, would be prominent and unduly overbearing due to its dimensions and proximity, creating a sense of enclosure at this part of the rear garden at No. 80.
9. Evidence suggests the proposal would have a negligible impact on the living conditions of residents of No. 80 with regard to light, and the Council raised no objection in this regard. However, for the above reasons, it remains that the proposal would unduly harm the outlook experienced by the residents of No. 80.
10. For the reasons given, the proposal would result in significant adverse harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at No. 80 Greencroft Road, with particular regard to outlook.

Other Matters

11. Prior approval has been granted at the site for a single storey rear extension of 6m in depth and 3.38m in height, with an eaves height of 2.42m. However, I note that an element of this approved extension is offset from the rear boundary with No. 80, such that it is distinguishable from the scheme before me. Despite the decreased height of the proposal when compared with the approved extension, the proposed full 6m projection immediately along the shared boundary with No. 80 would result in unacceptable impacts with regard to the outlook of neighbouring residents.
12. Reference is made to prior approval having been granted for a 6m deep and 2.9m high single storey rear projection at No. 80. However, limited detail on this is provided, and there is nothing before me or observed on site to suggest certainty at this stage of this coming forward, such that I attach limited weight to this.
13. I note that the proposal would provide additional living accommodation for the appellant, and would be less cramped than that of the approved extension. While this benefit of the scheme is acknowledged, it carries little weight. Even when taken together with the other matters above, this would not outweigh the harm that I have identified to the living conditions of residents at No. 80.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

C Rafferty

INSPECTOR