

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 April 2017

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3169800

28 Springwell Road, Hounslow TW5 9EJ

- 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 Datla Venkatapathi against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow Council.
 - The application Ref 01051/28/P3, dated 3 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a part first storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect on the character and appearance of the area; and the effect on the living conditions of the residents of 26 and 30 Springwell Road with regard to light and outlook.

Reasons

3. The proposal would result in a first floor addition above the larger single storey extension to the rear of this semi-detached property. It would be set down from the main ridge and it would have a roof pitch to match the existing hipped roof. It would be marginally more than half the width of the rear elevation. Despite the scale of the ground floor addition, this proposal would remain subservient to the original scale and character of the dwelling and it would be of a complementary design and materials. It would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the area or conflict with the design objectives of Policies CC1, CC2 or SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (LP). As these policies generally accord with the design requirements of the *National Planning Policy Framework*, I afford them considerable weight.
 4. The Council have raised concerns with regard to the impact of the proposal on the neighbouring residents. The attached property, 26 Springwell Road, has a ground floor extension so the proposal would have no impact on the rear facing ground floor windows. The windows in that extension that face the appeal property appear to be secondary windows and are set sufficiently away from the boundary. The nearest rear facing first floor window would have a separation distance from the extension and an angle of view that would not result in an unacceptable reduction in outlook.
-

5. The extension would be directly to the south of number 26 and as such, any loss of direct sunlight would be for only a short period in the late mornings. This would not unacceptably impact on the first floor window. Light levels overall, would remain generally unaltered.
6. There is a side passage between 30 Springwell Road and the appeal dwelling. The neighbouring property does not have a ground floor rear extension. The limited distance of the rear facing ground floor window to the proposed extension, in combination with its depth at first floor level, would result in it being overbearing when in the neighbouring ground floor room. It would therefore unacceptably reduce the outlook from that room and harm the amenities of the residents of 30 Springwell Road. To a lesser extent, it would reduce the outlook from the nearest first floor window but this appears to serve a bathroom.
7. With regard to light, the orientation would ensure that only very early morning direct sunlight, during the summer months, would be reduced and at all other times, light levels and shading would not be materially altered. I do not find that this would unacceptably harm the living conditions of the residents.
8. The proposal would not result in unacceptable harm with regard to light or shading and the amenities of the residents of number 26 would not be unacceptably harmed with regard to outlook. However, the proposal would harm the living conditions of the residents of 30 Springwell Road with regard to outlook from the rear room served by the ground floor window. As this impact could be reduced by setting the extension further away or by it having a reduced depth, I consider that in this respect, it represents poor design. It would conflict with the amenity requirements of LP Policy SC7(f) and as this accords with the *Framework*, I afford it considerable weight.
9. The Council make reference to their Supplementary Planning Guidance document: Residential Extension Guidelines 2003. This appears to outlaw almost all two storey extensions unless the house is unusually wide or is detached. It is a document of some age that no longer relates to the current development plan policies. It does not take into account more recent changes with regard to permitted development rights. The proposal would conflict with the guidance but I afford this very limited weight in these circumstances.
10. I have considered all the matters put forward by the appellant and I note that objections were not received from the adjacent residents. However, these matters are not sufficient to outweigh my concern in relation to the living conditions of the residents of 30 Springwell Road with regard to outlook. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR