



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 2 April 2025

by Juliet Rogers BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 April 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/F5540/D/24/3348797

Proposal: construction of a ground floor rear glazed link extension, the siting of air conditioning units to the flank wall and a front porch at 14 Clairvale Road, Hounslow TW5 9AE.

Application Ref: P/2023/3768.

Appeal B Ref: APP/F5540/D/24/3350093

Proposal: raising the height of the pitched roof on the first-floor rear extension at 14 Clairvale Road, Hounslow TW5 9AE.

Application Ref: P/2023/3785.

Appeal A Decision – planning permission is granted.

Appeal B Decision – planning permission is granted.

Preliminary Matters - I observed all the development pursuant to Appeal A and Appeal B had been implemented. Therefore, I have determined the appeals retrospectively.

Reasons

Appeal A issue – the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area

1. The link constructed between the host property and the outbuilding to the rear is no wider or taller than the existing rear flat-roofed extension. With fully glazed sides and roof with frames that match the windows in the host property, the link is an innocuous addition which is barely identifiable from public or private spaces. Whilst providing additional floorspace, the usability of the link as living accommodation is restricted by its width and depth. It has a functionality more similar to that of a corridor and, in so doing, maximises the use of the outbuilding. Whether the outbuilding has been constructed under permitted development rights or does not benefit from planning permission is not a matter for this decision.
2. The porch constructed to the front of the host property projects further than the frontage of the bay window and is of a width that encroaches on it, contrary to the guidance set out in the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines SPG¹. However, its design and use of matching materials to other porches in the street combine to create an addition that does not dominate the character of the host property or the street scene.

¹ Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)

3. As the air conditioning (a/c) units are sited towards the rear of the property on the side elevation, they are not readily identifiable from the pavement or road and, therefore, do not have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the street scene. Given other dwellings nearby have a/c units installed they are not alien features in the area.
4. The development does not harm the character and appearance of the area and accords with the policies cited in the decision notice.

Appeal A issue – the effect of the development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers of 12 Clairvale Road (No.12) with particular reference to noise.

5. The nearest opening of the neighbouring property is a first-floor window in the rear elevation. This serves a bathroom. Other windows in the side elevation of No.12 are associated with the hall, stairs and landing. Therefore, the nearest opening serving a habitable room is located on the first floor, closer to the party wall between No.12 and 10 Clairvale Road.
6. During my site visit one of the a/c units was operational and was barely audible when I stood in the passageway between No.12 and the host property, and significantly quieter and a more consistent sound than that of aircraft taking off or landing intermittently at Heathrow Airport nearby. Based on these observations and combined with the distance between this noise source and the nearest window serving a habitable room at No.12, unacceptable disturbance to neighbouring occupiers would not occur when the a/c units are in operation. The lack of a noise assessment does not preclude such a conclusion being reached.
7. The development does not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers of No.12, with particular reference to noise, and accords with the policies cited in the decision notice.

Appeal B issue – the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area

8. The ridge height of the pitched roof of the first-floor rear extension has been constructed at a higher level than previously approved². Nonetheless, the eaves of the modified roof align with those of the host property and the new ridgeline matches the height of the rear dormer. Although the resultant slope of the roof is steeper than previously approved, the lower ridgeline level, consistent eaves and use of matching materials ensures the extension is subordinate to the host property.
9. The development does not harm the character and appearance of the area and accords with the policies cited in the decision notice.

Conditions

Appeal A:

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: Unnumbered 1:1250 Location Plan; Unnumbered 1:500 Site Plan; 202 – Existing Elevations; 201 rev B – Existing Plans and Elevations.

Reason: to provide certainty.

² Council Ref: 00266/14/P2, dated 15 September 2021

Appeal B:

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: Unnumbered 1:1250 Location Plan; Unnumbered 1:500 Site Plan; 202 – Existing Elevations; 301 rev A – Existing Plans; 201 rev A – Existing Plans and Elevations.

Reason: to provide certainty.

Conclusion

10. The development complies with the development plan as a whole and nothing indicates a decision should be made otherwise.

Juliet Rogers

INSPECTOR