

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2017

by Y Wright BSc (Hons) DipTP MSc DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 1 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/16/3162232

3 Letchworth Avenue, Feltham, Middlesex TW14 9RZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Zulene Moura against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00693/3/PA1, dated 6 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 31 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 require the local planning authority to assess the proposed development solely on the basis of its impact on the amenity of the occupiers of adjoining properties, taking into account any representations received. My determination of this appeal has been made in the same manner.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached two storey house within a residential area. The attached house at No 1 has a single storey rear extension that is less than 3m in depth. There is also a larger single storey extension to the rear of the other neighbouring property at No 5. The properties are separated by close boarded wooden fencing.
 4. The proposed single storey extension would be approximately 6m deep and would be less than 3m at the eaves. The submitted plans indicate that the scheme would span almost the entire width of the property and would be adjacent to the shared garden boundary with No 1.
 5. Whilst I recognise the height of the proposal would be less than 3m, a proportion of the side elevation would be visible above the existing garden boundary fence and vegetation, for a depth of more than 3m beyond the rear elevation of the neighbour's extension. By reason of its overall length and proximity to the common boundary, the proposed extension would increase the sense of enclosure for the occupants of No 1. The resultant overbearing form of development would be likely to have an adverse impact on how the
-

occupiers of this property might use their ground floor habitable rooms and garden. I therefore consider that the proposal would give rise to an unacceptable impact on living conditions for the occupiers of No 1 in terms of outlook.

6. Whilst the extension would also be visible from No 5, this would appear more limited as the extension would be set back from the shared boundary by the existing driveway which would be maintained. Furthermore the existing extension at No 5 is much deeper than that at No 1. For these reasons I find the development would not lead to significant harm to outlook for the occupiers of No 5. Nevertheless this does not outweigh the material harm I have found to the occupiers of No 1.
7. I note that the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) seeks a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. Consequently taking the above into account I conclude that the proposal would not accord with the Framework in this regard. The proposal would also be contrary to the Hounslow Local Plan (2015) policies CC2 and SC7 and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Residential Extensions Guidelines' (2003), which all include seeking development that minimises harm to neighbouring residents in relation to matters such as outlook.
8. In reaching this conclusion I have noted that the extension would have a flat roof and would be constructed in materials that would match those of the main dwelling. However I can only determine the appeal on the basis of its effect on the amenity of the occupiers of adjoining properties, not on character and appearance. Furthermore, I am unable to consider issues between neighbours about matters such as the removal of shrubbery as these are not planning considerations.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Y Wright

INSPECTOR