



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 July 2025

by **D Cramond BSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/25/3367933
212 Cranford Lane, Hounslow, TW5 9JD

- 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 Manpreet Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Reference is P/2025/0722.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side extension, part first floor rear extension and a front porch extension following the demolition of existing garage to the house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two-storey side extension, part first floor rear extension and a front porch extension following the demolition of existing garage to the house at 212 Cranford Lane, Hounslow, TW5 9JD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2025/0722, 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: Fire safety statement and 2025/026-01, 2025/026-02, 2025/026-03, 2025/026-04, 2025/026-05, 2025/026-06, 2025/026-07, 2025/026-08, 2025/026-09, 2025/026-10 REV A & 2025/026-011.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on living conditions of neighbours.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an extended semi-detached two-storey home on a rectangular plot set a little back off the well-used Cranford Lane. This stretch of road is residential in character with a variety of house types and sizes. The appeal property is of greater height and bulk than its detached neighbouring dwelling (No 210) which lies to the east on a corner plot. It is presently separated by the Appellant's single storey flat roofed garage / outbuilding. The proposal is as described above and would incorporate the demolition of this structure.
-

Living conditions

4. The Council considers that neighbours' living conditions at No 210 would be harmed through dominance, loss of outlook, and undue sense of enclosure for the rear amenity space.
5. Rear building lines and form are very varied locally. For this small group of dwellings, the rear gardens face southwards. Given the planned height and positioning off the shared boundary I would deem that the new single storey rear-projecting element would be benign in terms of neighbours' amenity. In a well-designed approach, the upper-level part of the scheme has an appreciably shorter projection than the single storey accommodation. Whilst it would come beyond the two-storey part of next door this extra dimension would not be extensive. In my opinion given relative orientations, the arrangement of gardens and built spaces, and the general inter-visibility of some built form from most indoor and outdoor angles locally I would conclude that there would be no sense of being unduly hemmed-in, no appreciable loss of outlook, and extremely little in the way of additional shadowing. The rear amenity space at No 210 could continue to be enjoyed.
6. Hounslow Local Plan Policies CC2 and SC7 are relevant 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. The Council's *Hounslow Character, Sustainability and Design Codes SPD* includes similar a objective. In this instance, for the reasons I have given, I am satisfied that the amenity aims of that document would not be breached by the appeal scheme.

Conditions

7. 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. A condition on matching materials is reasonable in the interests of visual amenity.

Overall conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the living conditions of neighbours. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR