
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2016

by Jonathan Price BA(Hons) DMS DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 2 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/16/3155030

121 Southville Close, Feltham, London TW14 8AN

- 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 Saleem Ahmed against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01038/121/P2, dated 21 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear and side extension to existing house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is part of an estate of a quite uniform architectural character, comprising well-designed houses with hipped roofs and gable features. No 121 is at the end of a terrace of houses which, like the ends of similar blocks nearby, has a gabled front elevation and a half-width cat-slide roof hipped at the side.
 4. The front elevation of No 121 faces onto a large area of green space, with the rear elevation backing onto the estate road, where there is garaging. The house has a somewhat insubstantial, transparent-sheet covered area attached to the side which projects onto a shed at the front, and this elevation of the house is currently screened by a tall hedge. The proposal is for a single-storey side and rear extension which wraps around the house. Although this addition would replace the rather unattractive covered area, and would remain partly obscured by the boundary hedge, any replacement ought nonetheless to be sympathetic with the design of the main house.
 5. The single-storey extension, which would be in line with the front wall of the house and wrap round the side and rear, would compete harmfully with, and pay little regard to, the character of the main building. The crown-roof, with just a fringe hipped roof along the front and side, would not be a satisfactory design solution and fail to overcome the harmful effect the large area of extension would have on the original built form of the house, where the
-

symmetrical cat-slide roofs are notable architectural features of the ends of these terraces.

6. Despite the matching materials proposed this extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the main house and to the area in general. The proposals would not be supported by Local Plan¹ (LP) Policy CC1 which seeks that new development enhances the character of an area and that poor quality design is refused. The scheme would not meet the aims of LP Policy CC2 to promote high quality urban design and architecture, or those of LP Policy SC7, which require residential extensions to complement the original building, harmonise with adjoining properties and maintain the character of the general street scene. The proposals would also not accord with the advice in the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines².

Conclusions

7. I recognise that a more limited extension of this character might be built as permitted development and also that the Council has not found this proposal to materially harm the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers to the south, either in respect of outlook or loss of light. Nevertheless, the strong thrust of the Council's policies is to require residential extensions to be well-designed and to enhance the appearance of the host building and surrounding area. This scheme would not comply with these aims and, as a consequence, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathan Price

INSPECTOR

¹ London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030.

² London Borough of Hounslow Residential Extension Guidelines – October 2003.
