
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2017

by Graeme Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 31 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3166402

108A Hanover Avenue, Feltham, London TW13 4JP

- 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 Hasan Ali against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00551/108A/P4, dated 14 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is an erection of first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of occupiers of 108 Hanover Avenue, with particular reference to outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is set back a considerable distance from the roadside of Hanover Avenue and significantly behind the front façade of the neighbouring property at No 108. The site itself is heavily tapered towards the front of the plot, its narrow frontage opening out somewhat towards the rear of the plot to provide a well-proportioned rear garden area. In this respect, the appeal property and its adjoining half are somewhat at odds with the prevailing layout of properties in the surrounding area, which generally enjoy particularly long but narrow rear gardens.
 4. Due to the siting of the appeal property relative to No 108, the appeal property already has a significant presence at the rear of the neighbouring property. Although No 108A has previously been extended at ground floor at the side and rear, the design of that extension and the nature of the intervening boundary are such that it is a largely discrete addition that has a minimal impact on the outlook from the rear of No 108.
 5. I accept that by utilising the existing ground floor element the extension would be inset from the boundary by an amount greater than the 0.3 metre minimum set out in the London Borough of Hounslow Residential Extension Guidelines (REG). However, the proposed first floor extension would nonetheless significantly add to the height and bulk of the existing ground floor of the host
-

property whilst the front elevation would face directly towards the rear corner of No 108 and first section of the kinked flank elevation would run parallel, and close to, a significant length of the shared boundary immediately to the rear of No 108. The offset and angle between the two properties would, in my judgement, exacerbate the impact of this relationship.

6. I acknowledge too, that the flank wall of the extension would be kinked, following the alignment of the ground floor by turning away from the shared boundary between the two adjacent properties. Whilst this would ensure that the rearmost part of the extension would not be particularly visible from, or overbearing upon, the rear of No 108, it would nonetheless remain a significant presence from areas of the rear garden closest to the rear of No 108. Although I have noted the appellant's suggestion that it would instead be areas at the far end of the garden of No 108 that tend to be used more heavily for sitting out, it seems more likely to me that areas closer to the rear of the property are more likely to be used for such purposes, where the height and bulk of both elements of this kinked flank wall would be most keenly felt.
7. Whilst No 108 enjoys a relatively long rear garden, the garden plots are narrow and the proposed extension would be sited close to the boundary. In the context of the otherwise open rear aspects that typify much of the surrounding area, this degree of proximity, height and bulk, together with the particular offset and relationship between No 108A and No 108, would have a significantly enclosing, looming and overbearing presence over No 108.
8. Thus, for the reasons set out, I conclude that the proposal would result in an overly dominant form of development that would be unacceptably, and harmfully, overbearing and intrusive upon the outlook from the rear of No 108. The proposed extension would therefore be contrary to policy SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (LP) and the guidance set out in the REG and, in turn, would fail to achieve the high quality development that LP policy CC2 seeks to achieve. The proposal would also be at odds with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks, as one of its core planning principles, to ensure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.
9. It is common ground that the proposal would not have any adverse impacts in terms of privacy or daylight, or in terms of the character and appearance of the surrounding area. I see no reason to disagree. However, these factors do not outweigh the harm that I have previously found.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Graeme Robbie

INSPECTOR