



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 2025 by Kim Vo MPLAN

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/25/3361746

10 Hamilton Road, Feltham TW13 4PW

- 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 Mrs. Unza Khan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/3851.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'retrospective application for a rear conservatory'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for development described as a 'retrospective application for a rear conservatory' at 10 Hamilton Road, Feltham TW13 4PW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2024/3851, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted relates to the following approved plans, drawing references RP01 and RP02.
 - 2) The materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be as they are set out on 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. A rear conservatory has been erected. It is unclear as to whether this has been built entirely in accordance with the plans before me in the appeal which, for clarity, I have based my recommendation on and referred to above.
4. The emerging Hounslow Local Plan 2020-2041 (ELP) is programmed to be adopted in 2026. However, I am not aware of the exact stage of preparation it has reached, the extent of any unresolved objections to relevant policies, or whether these will be considered consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework. Consequently, and whilst I have taken the ELP into account, I have considered the appeal under the adopted development plan at the time.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effect of the conservatory on a) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area; and b) the living conditions of the occupiers of Number 2 Denison Road with specific regard to outlook and light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

6. The appeal building is a semi-detached bungalow with an existing single storey rear extension. It is located at a corner junction, where Denison Road and Hamilton Road meet. This results in the appeal building having an angled orientation. The surrounding area is characterised by several rear extensions of varying sizes and designs. These include Number 2 Denison Road (No. 2) and Number 8 Hamilton Road (No. 8), which both have single storey rear additions.
7. The conservatory adjoins an existing extension and would have a total depth exceeding the maximum limits of 3.65m for a semi-detached house. It, therefore, fails to fully comply with Section 3 of the Hounslow Character, Sustainability and Design Codes Supplementary Planning Document 2024 (SPD).
8. However, the SPD provides design guidance, and the conservatory is compliant in terms of having a flat roof and it being sited well within the property boundaries. Moreover, it does not appear excessive or out of scale with the surrounding developments. It has an overall depth which follows the building lines of the existing rear extensions at No. 2 and No. 8. The conservatory is also narrower and set away from the side boundaries. Its total height is lower than the roof of the existing rear extension. The conservatory therefore appears in scale with and subservient to the host dwelling. The flat roof form complements the surrounding flat roof rear extensions. The roof glazing and side/rear openings also distinctly defines the structure as a conservatory, which are common developments within residential areas. It is not visible from public areas due to its siting to the rear.
9. For these reasons, the conservatory does not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. Accordingly, it does not conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (LP). Together, and amongst other things, these seek developments to respond sensitively to the site and its wider context, ensuring alterations and additions do not harm the character and appearance of the building and its surroundings.

Living Conditions

10. No. 2's closest rear elevation window to the appeal building serves a habitable room. The conservatory projects beyond it. However, the window is obscure glazed and tucked away at a corner enclosed by a boundary fence to one side, and No. 2's existing rear extension to the other. Consequently, the light received to and the outlooks from it are already limited. The conservatory is also sufficiently distanced away from the shared boundary. It is also a single storey structure with a flat roof, set lower than the existing rear extension. Therefore, given its small-scale size and siting, it does not result in a detrimental loss of outlook or light to No. 2's nearest window.

11. For these reasons, the conservatory does not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 2. Accordingly, it does not conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the LP. Together, and amongst other things, these seek for development proposals to not result in harm to the amenity of neighbouring residents. The totality of the rearward projection of the dwelling does not accord with the SPD, but this does not result in harm on this main issue either, for the reasons I have set out.

Other Matters

12. The conservatory would be used in association with the residential activities of the host dwelling. I do not therefore feel that noise would be a source of harm in planning terms, for the purposes of this decision. Its side windows are also fixed shut which complies with the SPD. Additionally, views from the conservatory are restricted due to the high boundary. Thus, the privacy of the neighbouring gardens is maintained.
13. The matter of the conservatory's effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 8 was not a contentious one in the appeal. Given that No. 8 has a similarly large rear extension, I do not disagree with the Council's findings in this regard.

Conditions

14. To provide certainty and for enforcement purposes, it is necessary to impose a condition to specify the approved plans. A condition is also necessary to ensure the materials accord with the details submitted in the application form. They would be acceptable for the appearance of the host dwelling.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed given it complies with the development plan and there is nothing compelling to suggest a decision other than in accordance therewith.

Kim Vo

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions set out above.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR