



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2025

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/24/3358254

29 Kingsley Road, Hounslow TW3 1PA

- 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 Mr Babji Vundavilli against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application reference is P/2024/3299.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear infill extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey rear infill extension at 29 Kingsley Road, Hounslow TW3 1PA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2024/3299, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development firstly, on the living conditions of the occupiers of 27 Kingsley Road with particular regard to outlook, sense of enclosure and light; and secondly, on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

3. The proposal is to erect a single storey flat roof extension at the rear of the appeal property, which is a 2-storey mid-terrace dwelling within an area of mixed character. An existing ground floor rear projection and a small, detached outbuilding would be demolished and removed to make way for the new addition.

Living conditions

4. To one side of the site is 27 Kingsley Road, which is a 2-storey mid-terrace house with a part width ground floor rear addition, which includes 2 windows that face the site. I saw that one of these existing windows was high level, narrow and included obscure glazing. Consequently, it is highly unlikely to serve a main habitable room.
5. The other rear window of No 27, situated nearest to the main dwelling, faces the existing flank wall of the rear projection that is proposed to be replaced. On that basis, the view from this window towards a solid brick wall at reasonably close range would not significantly change if the appeal scheme were to proceed.
6. The new flank wall alongside the shared boundary with No 27 would be longer than its existing counterpart that is to be removed. As a result, the narrow passageway

at the back of No 27, which allows access from the main dwelling to the rear garden would be further enclosed by the new development. Even so, this passageway is already largely enclosed by the screening erected along the common boundary with the site and the plastic sheeting that covers the roof above this outside space. In that context, the presence of the new built form would not significantly increase the sense of enclosure as it would be experienced at the rear of No 27. As the new addition would be just to the north of the rear of No 27, there would be no appreciable loss of sunlight to this neighbouring dwelling. Any loss of daylight would be marginal given the screening already in place around and above the rear of No 27.

7. In summary, the proposal would be close to and visible from the rear of No 27. However, the scale of the new extension would not cause it to overly dominate, result in a loss of natural light nor unduly heighten a sense of enclosure for the occupiers of No 27.

Character and appearance

8. The new addition would extend across the full width of the host building and, according to the Council, it would project outwards from the main rear wall by almost 7-metres. It would therefore be a sizeable addition. The proposal would comfortably exceed the maximum depth for extensions of this type that are advised in the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). That said, the SPD also acknowledges that local circumstances can vary, and that each application should be determined on its own merits.
9. In this case, the overall scale of the proposed extension would not be readily evident from any one direction. From beyond the rear garden of No 29, the extension would appear as subservient in height and form to the main house and the wider terrace beyond it. From the rear windows of No 27, only the new sidewall would be evident. Glimpses of the new rear elevation and flank wall from the track that runs beyond the rear of the site would give little indication of the overall size of the extension. None of the extension would be seen from in front of No 29. Matching materials would be used, and the windows would be in keeping with the style and general appearance of the main house.
10. From the submitted evidence, and based on my observations, other properties within the same terrace as No 29, including 31 Kingsley Riad next to the site, include large flat roof rear extensions. In that context, the proposal would not appear overly large, bulky, obtrusive nor would it disrupt the pattern of existing development. As such, the appeal scheme would not be an uncharacteristic addition given the proliferation of large rear extensions to nearby properties.

Conclusion on the main issues

11. On the main issues, I conclude that the proposed development would not cause significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 27 or to the character and appearance of the host building or the local area. As such, there is no conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030. These policies aim to ensure that development complements the original building, harmonises with adjoining properties, maintains local character and minimises harm to neighbouring residents. It would also accord with the National Planning Policy Framework 2024, which aims to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character and provides a high standard of amenity for all users.

12. These principles underpin the advice within the Council's SPD, with which the proposal would broadly comply. Given the local circumstances in this case, a conflict with part of the guidance within the Council's SPD is insufficient reason to withhold planning permission.
13. The Officer's report notes that an interested party raises concern that the proposal would lead to a loss of privacy. However, no additional windows would face the rears of properties on either side of the site. A condition could also be imposed to ensure that any extra openings in the sidewall of the extension would require the Council's approval. On that basis, there would be no additional overlooking towards the adjacent properties if the appeal scheme were to come forward.

Conditions

14. In addition to the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to impose a condition that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development, a condition is imposed to require the use of external materials that match those of the existing dwelling, as proposed. To safeguard the living conditions of the occupiers of No 27, a condition is attached to ensure that no windows or openings are constructed on the side elevation of the extension without the Council's approval.
15. These conditions reflect those suggested by the Council with reference to the removal of some permitted development rights inserted into No 4 for clarity.

Conclusion

16. There are no material considerations that indicate the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons set out above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR

Schedule of 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: 1054-01 Rev 01, 1054-02 Rev 01, 1054-03.1 Rev 01, 1054-3.2 Rev 01, 1054-04.1 Rev 01 and the Location 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.
- 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows or openings shall be constructed on the side elevation of the development hereby permitted that faces the property known as 27 Kingsley Road.