



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 June 2025

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/25/3365578

39 Alderney Avenue, Hounslow, TW5 0QN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr J Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Reference is P/2024/4282.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a detached outbuilding in the rear garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a detached outbuilding in the rear garden at 39 Alderney Avenue, Hounslow, TW5 0QN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2024/4282, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three 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 dwelling.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL-01 & PL-100. For the avoidance of doubt the drawing issue of plan PL-100 which is hereby permitted defines the outbuilding's ridge height as 3.11 metres.
 4. The building hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as 39 Alderney Avenue, Hounslow, TW5 0QN.

Procedural Matter

2. There is an absence of clarity over the proposed ridge height for the outbuilding given the lack of dates and revision references on the submitted plans. It appears that the Council made an assessment of a scheme with a 3.668 metre ridge height; the Appellant's latest plan indicates a ridge height of 3.110 metres and by implication they wish this to be the appeal proposal. For my part I see no prejudice to any party by my assessing the scheme with a 3.110 ridge height and I shall take
-

my consideration and decision forward on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on a) the character and appearance of the host property and locality and b) living conditions of neighbours.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a sizeable two-storey semi-detached extended home on a generously sized plot backing onto open land. It sits in a stretch of broadly similar homes and the immediate locality is of established residential character; the suburban streetscene is a pleasing one.
5. The proposal is as described above and would have a shallow hipped roof about 3.11 metres to ridge and some 2.25 metres to eaves. The floor area of the building, which is shown for Garden Store, Gym and Home Office is relatively extensive given planned width of around 5.35 metres and depth of some 12 metres.
6. A Certificate of Lawfulness P/2024/3050 has been granted for an outbuilding with a similar use and footprint with a 2.50 metre high flat roof rather than the now proposed hipped roof. I would agree with the principal parties that this is a realistic fall-back position.

Character and appearance

7. The Council considers that the planned outbuilding would fail to clearly read as subservient to the main dwellinghouse and would harm the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area because of its inappropriate position and design.
8. I recognise that the scheme would have an appreciable footprint but the dwelling it relates to is a bulky house and this planned building would have a low-level profile. The garden, both existing and remaining, would offer a generous degree of outside amenity space and the building would be viewed against the backdrop of undeveloped land beyond. Rear building lines and the arrangement and type of outbuildings vary greatly locally and there is no set template. The positioning of the building in terms of on-site arrangement would appear logical to me with it making use of part of the longest boundary side and a far garden corner. I would deem that the building would not have wider impacts on the area generally or look ill-at-ease from any close vantage. I would add that I appreciate the visual reasoning for the Appellant wishing a (low) hipped roof rather than a flat one as per paragraph 6 above.
9. Hounslow Local Plan (LP) Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7, taken together and amongst other matters, call for development which relates to the form, scale and character of a site and its surrounds. In all the circumstances I conclude that the appeal scheme would not conflict with these objectives.
10. The Council's *Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document* (September 2006) (the SPD) includes similar objectives. In this instance, for the

reasons I have given, I am satisfied that aesthetic aims of that document would not be breached by the appeal scheme.

Living conditions

11. The Council considers that neighbours' living conditions would be harmed by the scheme's position and design leading to loss of outlook and an increased sense of enclosure.
12. Whilst the structure would be higher than the present boundary fencing and vegetation it would be of a low hipped roof form sloping away from the boundary and the rear of the dwelling. The pertinent neighbours would continue to have a wide vista down their generous garden, with open land beyond, and I am satisfied would not feel unduly hemmed in. Given orientation and height there would to my mind be no meaningful loss of sunlight. The view of the scheme would largely be of an uninterrupted brick wall, with planting on the neighbours' side. Whilst a little higher than normal rear garden boundary 'permitted development' walls or fences, it would appear proportionate on this scale of garden and given its distance from the main rear elevation of the neighbours' home.
13. LP Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 and the objectives of the SPD are also relevant under this issue in that taken together and amongst other matters they seek to secure development which would not be unduly harmful to residential amenity. Given the above I conclude that the proposal would not conflict with the policy aim of protecting living conditions or the parallel objectives of the SPD.

Conditions

14. The Council reasonably suggests the standard commencement condition. I agree with the proposition of a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans as this provides certainty; ridge height should be specified to ensure this. A condition on matching materials is reasonable in the interests of visual amenity. As also suggested, there should be a condition to restrict future use in the interests of amenity. My wording on this is a simplified version of that proposed by the Council.

Overall conclusion

15. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and locality or on the living conditions of neighbours. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR