

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2017

**by Alexander Walker MPlan MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 17 February 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/16/3163186**  
**65 Clifford Road, Hounslow TW4 7LR**

- 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 Dr RK Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
  - The application Ref 00280/65/P14, dated 6 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 31 October 2016.
  - The development proposed is proposed first floor rear extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

### Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupants of the neighbouring residential property, No 67 Clifford Road, with particular regard to outlook and light; and, the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

### Reasons

#### *Living Conditions*

3. The proposed first-floor extension would sit above an existing single-storey extension, which almost abuts the western boundary of the appeal property with No 67 Clifford Road. The boundary comprises a high, brick wall. On the opposite side of the wall is the rear garden area of No 67, which is relatively short in depth. The boundary wall is slightly higher than the existing single-storey extension.
4. The first-floor extension would rise substantially above the height of the boundary wall and would extend the majority of its length. Given its proximity to the boundary it would significantly reduce the outlook from the rear garden of No 67 resulting in an unacceptable overbearing impact on the occupants of the property.
5. Furthermore, the amount of light entering the garden would be significantly reduced. This would be exacerbated by the positioning of the extension to the east of No 67, which would likely result in a significant amount of the garden being in shade for much of the day, particularly during the mornings and therefore would have a particularly detrimental effect on the usability of the garden.

6. As a result of the extension, there would be two-storey development along almost the full length of the eastern boundary of the rear of No 67. Due to its proximity to the boundary and its height, this would create an unacceptable sense of enclosure that would be significantly harmful to the living conditions of the occupants of No 67.
7. I note that the extension would have a hipped roof to mitigate any impact on the living conditions of the occupants of No 57. However, I do not find that it would sufficiently reduce the harm I have identified above.
8. I also note that no objections to the proposal were received from the occupants of neighbouring properties. However, I have considered the proposal based on an assessment of its effect on existing and future occupants of the neighbouring properties.
9. I find therefore that the proposal would significantly harm the living conditions of the occupants of No 67 Clifford Road in respect of outlook and the amount of light, contrary to Policy CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 - 2030 (LP), which, amongst other matters, seeks to ensure that development has a positive impact on the amenity of current residents.

#### *Character and Appearance*

10. The area is predominantly residential and generally comprises two-storey terraced dwellings, although there are a small number of detached properties. The appeal property is a large, detached, two-storey building located on the corner of Clifford Road and Basildene Road. The ground floor is occupied by a doctors surgery and the first floor is in residential use. The front of the property is accessed off Clifford Road and the rear, which is the entrance to the surgery, is accessed off Basildene Road. The property has been extended over the years, with the most notable addition being the single-storey extension on the rear, which was the subject of a previous appeal<sup>1</sup> allowed in 2011.
11. As a result of its corner plot location and its substantial size, the building is prominent in the streetscene. Its size in comparison to the neighbouring properties and its advertisements result in the property being very much read as a community facility within the wider residential area.
12. The first-floor extension would effectively infill the open space at first floor level between the appeal property and No 80a Basildene Road. As a result of its size and height, the extension would dominate the existing building. When read in conjunction with the existing single-storey extension, it would almost appear as a separate building to the original property, rather than a subservient extension to it. This would be exacerbated by the use of a hipped roof that would not comfortably tie in with the existing roof form.
13. Furthermore, the overall size of the resultant building would be excessively large and would fail to respect the original building or the general scale of the residential built form of the area.
14. I find therefore, that the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. As such, it would be contrary to Policies CC1 and CC2 of the LP, which seek to ensure that

---

<sup>1</sup> Appeal Ref APP/F5540/A/2157917

development sensitively and creatively responds to an areas character and promotes high quality design.

### **Other Matters**

15. I have had regard to the reasons for the extension; providing additional accommodation to enable essential treatments and procedures, including ultrasounds and blood tests. I note that the proposal has received the support of the NHS. The proposal would clearly provide benefits to the local community though improved healthcare facilities. However, I do not find that these benefits outweigh the harm I have identified above with regard to the significantly harmful effects it would have on the living conditions of the occupants of No 67 Clifford Road and the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

### **Conclusion**

16. For the reasons given above, having regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

*Alexander Walker*

INSPECTOR