



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 March 2025

by **J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/24/3356170

32 Orchard Avenue, Hounslow, TW5 0DU

- 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 Gajinder Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/2700.
 - The development proposed is proposed part single part double side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a proposed part single part double side and rear extension at 32 Orchard Avenue, Hounslow, TW5 0DU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2024/2700, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) No additional windows or openings shall be formed in the side elevation of the development hereby permitted at first floor level or above.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2024/122-01; 02; 03; 04; 05; 06; 07 (Location and Block Plans); 07 (Existing and Proposed Roof Plan); 08; and the Fire Statement received 08/08/2024.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 34 Orchard Avenue, with particular reference to outlook and light.

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a semi-detached two storey dwelling, paired with 30 Orchard Avenue. It is in an area comprising mainly semi-detached dwellings of a similar design and appearance.

4. The Council's concerns are in relation to the proposed two storey side extension, and more specifically, its effect of the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling, 34 Orchard Avenue.
5. Nos 32 and 34 Orchard Avenue are staggered in relation to each other, with the front elevation of No 32 being broadly level with the main two storey rear wall of No 34. The proposed side extension would therefore project beyond the original rear wall of No 34 to its full extent.
6. No 34 has a single storey extension to the rear and accordingly, the windows on the ground floor of the extension would not be significantly affected by the proposed development in terms of the amount of light received. The closest first floor window on the rear elevation of No 34 is obscure glazed and appears to serve a non-habitable bathroom. The other first floor window on the rear elevation of the dwelling is further away from the boundary with the appeal site and a 45 degree angle drawn from its centre point would not be breached by the proposal.
7. The appeal property is sited within a tapering plot which widens towards the rear reflecting its position at a bend in the road. Accordingly, the distance between the flank wall of the proposed extension and the side boundary would increase the deeper it extends into the plot thereby further reducing its effects on No 34.
8. The proposed extension would be to the south of No 34 and there is already some overshadowing to the rear of No 34 due to the siting of the existing dwelling, including the hip to gable extension and the large box dormer on its rear elevation. However, the proposed side extension would sit within the profile of the existing flank wall and would be at a lower level. Given the non-habitable nature of the closest window and the distance and siting of the proposal in relation to the first-floor bedroom window, there would be no significant additional loss of light to habitable rooms on the rear elevation of No 34. Furthermore, as No 34 has been extended to the rear at single storey level, the rear garden of the dwelling would not be significantly affected by the proposed development.
9. The main outlook from the habitable room windows on the rear elevation of 34 Orchard Avenue is over its own garden area. As the proposed extension would be splayed in relation to the side boundary with an increasing separation distance between the proposal and No 34, I am satisfied that it would not lead to an unacceptable sense of enclosure or loss of outlook and consequently, the living conditions of the occupiers of No 34 would not be materially harmed.
10. I therefore find that the proposed development would not have a significant harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 34 Orchard Avenue with particular reference to light and outlook. Accordingly, it would comply with Policies CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (2015) and the intent of the Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2017) which together and amongst other matters, seek to minimise harm to neighbouring residents by avoiding an unacceptable loss of daylight/sunlight, outlook or by creating an unacceptable sense of enclosure.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans condition is imposed for certainty. A condition requiring the use of matching materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the local

area. I have also imposed a condition to prevent the formation of additional openings in the flank elevation of the extension in the interests of the living conditions of the neighbouring occupier.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR