



---

## 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: 10 June 2025

---

#### Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/25/3360502

#### 138 Pears Road, Hounslow TW3 1SJ

- 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. Vijay Chohan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
  - The application Ref is P/2024/2949.
  - The development proposed is described as 'building a basic conservatory at rear garden'.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### 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. The plans show that the conservatory would have a depth of three metres. The Council states that when measured, it would be below that. For clarity, I have determined the appeal based on the plans provided. In addition, Hounslow's Emerging Local Plan 2020-2041 (ELP) is to be adopted in 2026. However, I am not aware of where it is at, the extent of any unresolved objections or whether it will be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework. I have taken the ELP into account but considered the appeal under the development plan at the time.

### Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on a) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area; and b) the living conditions of the occupiers of Number 136 Pears Road (No. 136) and Number 140 Pears Road (No. 140) with specific regard to light and outlook.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

#### *Character and Appearance*

5. The appeal building is a two storey, mid-terraced property in a residential area, with an existing single storey rear extension. The area includes several dwellings with rear extensions, including Nos. 136 and 140. Where they occur, they are of a limited overall depth, maintaining subservience in their footprint to the host dwelling

and thus a strong sense of consistency to the area which contributes positively to its character and appearance.

6. The proposal would have a flat roof set below the first-floor windows. It would be within the rear garden boundary and at ground floor. However, it would adjoin onto an existing extension and result in a total depth of some noticeable significance. This would more than marginally exceed the maximum depth for terraced properties, as specified by the Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (SPD).
7. Despite its low height and glazed finish, the proposal would result in a combined rear extension footprint of a substantially pronounced land take. Its width would also match the host dwelling's, leaving minimal clearance at the sides. Consequently, it would not appear as a subordinate or proportionate addition and would overwhelm the host dwelling, being unacceptably excessive against the quality of the area's consistency. The proposal would not be visible from public vantage points. However, it would be from a number of private rear gardens which is sufficient to find it unacceptable in character and appearance terms. I also remain to be convinced that the assortment of garden paraphernalia on surrounding plots is sufficient to acceptably reduce the harm I have found.
8. For these reasons, the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (LP) and the SPD. 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*

9. The proposal would be sited close to the rear garden's side boundaries. However, it would be a single storey structure with a flat roof, set lower than the existing rear extension. It would also be finished in clear acrylic roof sheets, with glazed openings to one side. Given the height and materials, the proposal would not result in a significant reduction of light to Nos. 136 and 140's rear elevation windows. Additionally, the existing high boundary fences already limit the outlooks to their respective garden areas. Due to the generous length and narrowness of the plots overall, extensive and otherwise unincumbered garden views would still be maintained, despite the proposal's close siting and overall depth.
10. For these reasons, the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of Nos. 136 and 140, in respect of light or outlook. Accordingly, it would not conflict with Policies CC2 or 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.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

11. Whilst I have found in the appellant's favour on the second main issue, this would be a neutral matter and not be capable of weighing against the harm I have found in regard to the first. Material considerations do not indicate a decision other than in accordance with the development plan, with which the scheme would conflict for the reasons I have set out. I therefore recommend the appeal should be dismissed.

*Kim Vo*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

**Inspector's Decision**

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

*John Morrison*

INSPECTOR