

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 April 2017

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 25 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3169471

87 Chertsey Road, Feltham, TW13 4RL

- 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 & Mrs M Rees against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref: 00242/87/P3 dated 5 December 2016 was refused by notice dated 31 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is one of a pair of modest, hip-ended semi-detached houses. The area comprises of a mix of properties, some of which have previously been extended. Despite the variance in built form, many of the properties have a hipped roof form or long pitched roofs and are set back behind front garden and parking areas on regular building lines. This built form and the low boundary treatments with vegetation in gardens, alongside street trees, gives the residential area a green and pleasant character. The proposal is to add a two-storey side extension with a gable ended roof. This would extend to the rear in line with the previous rear extension. A rear roof addition is also proposed.
 4. The proposed two storey side extension would be flush with the main front elevation of the house and the main ridgeline would be carried over the extension with the roof having a gable end. I appreciate that the side extension would not appear subordinate to the main dwelling but the appellant has set out that the proposal would adopt an 'integrated' style which would see the side extension setback from the bay window and the front porch on the main dwelling. Furthermore, despite the lack of a setback from the main front elevation or down from the ridge line, as there is an open area to the south of the appeal dwelling, I do not consider the proposal would result in a terracing effect.
-

5. This extension would however project to the rear of the original dwelling to be in line with the existing two storey rear projection. This would result in a lengthy side elevation which alongside the alterations to produce a gable end at roof level, would result in a dwelling with a greatly increased bulk. Although the appellant states that the side extension would not appear prominent, and I note the appeal property is set off the main highway on a service road, the open aspect to the south of the site means that side elevation is clearly visible. It would appear dominant in the streetscene and as an incongruous addition to the property.
6. The applicant has drawn my attention to a hip to gable alteration at No. 79 Chertsey Road but it is clear from the information provided, that this was considered to be Permitted Development by the Council through the granting of a Lawful Development Certificate. Whilst it does nevertheless form part of the streetscene, and I recognise that there are a mix of dwellings in the area, I was able to see that the majority of semi-detached properties in the area had hipped roof forms. The proposal would result in the unbalancing of this pair of semi-detached houses where the adjoining property retains a hipped roof form.
7. The rear roof extension would also occupy much of the width and height of the rear roof slope and appear as a large, over-sized addition to the host property. I recognise that the rear of the site is well screened and the appellant's comments on the visual impacts of developments to the rear of buildings. From my site observations, however, the rear roof slope is visible in views from Hamilton Road between properties where the development would appear as an obtrusive addition.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Council's Local Plan and the *Residential Extension Guidelines* Supplementary Planning Guidance which require, amongst other matters, high quality design that harmonises with adjoining properties and maintains the character of the general streetscene. This aspect of the proposal would also conflict with paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) which states that permission should be refused for poor design. It is also therefore not the form of sustainable development which the Framework intends there to be a presumption in favour of.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has stated that the additional accommodation would allow them a more comfortable use of the property and that the development would make use of an underutilised area to the side of the house. Whilst I acknowledge these factors, they do not outweigh the harm I have identified in respect of the main issue.
10. I also acknowledge that there would not be any adverse effects on neighbours living conditions or on usable private amenity space. These are however neutral considerations and not benefits of the proposal.

Conclusion

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

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR