

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2017

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3173887

4 Ellington Road, Feltham TW13 4RE

- 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 Mrs Miriam Moss against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00394/4/P2 was refused by notice dated 30 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear elevation flat roof kitchen extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area and on the living conditions of the occupiers of 2 and 6 Ellington Road with particular regard to outlook, visual impact and sense of enclosure.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The proposal is to erect a single storey extension at the back of the appeal property, which is a mainly 2-storey semi-detached house within a predominantly residential area. The new addition would extend outwards from the existing single storey projection of No 4 and infill the narrow recess at the rear of the main house.
 4. The new development would be a sizeable addition. It would extend across the entire width of the host building with a depth that would exceed, by some margin, the maximum threshold for extensions of this type set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance, *Residential Extension Guidelines* (SPG). Taken together with its largely flat roof, the proposal would appear as an overly large 'box-like' addition that would fail to respect the basic form, proportions and traditional style of the host building. The main outcome would be material harm to the character and appearance of both the host building and the local area.
-

Living conditions

5. The flank wall of the proposed extension would be close to and along the shared rear boundary with the attached property, which is 2 Ellington Road. Although modest in height, the length of the new flank wall along this boundary would be considerable, projecting well beyond the main rear elevation of No 2. As a result, the new extension would be evident at close range from the rear ground floor windows of No 2 at an oblique angle and its back garden.
6. Having carefully viewed the rear of No 2 from the site, I have little doubt that the new flank wall would unacceptably dominate outlook and overbear on the occupiers of this neighbouring property due to its considerable length and close proximity to the rear boundary with No 4. The new built form would also have the effect of further enclosing the space within and just beyond the narrow recess at the back of No 2. This arrangement would accentuate the tunnel effect when viewed from the ground floor rear window of No 2 nearest to the boundary with the site and the outdoor space just beyond it. In doing so, the proposal would unduly heighten a sense of enclosure when viewed from these particular vantage points, which would be unneighbourly.
7. The proposal would also result in a long flank wall parallel with the shared boundary of the property on the opposite side of the site, which is 6 Ellington Road. Nevertheless, the new wall would be visually separated from the rear of No 6 by a reasonable gap and it would be largely screened from view by the tall fence that marks the common boundary with the site. In those circumstances, the presence of the new development would not be so great as to dominate outlook nor be so imposing as to overbear on the occupiers of this adjacent property. Sufficient space would also be retained between Nos 4 and 6 to avoid any undue sense of enclosure with the new built form in place.

Conclusion on the main issues

8. On the main issues, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the local area and materially reduce the living conditions of the occupiers of No 2. Accordingly, it conflicts with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan (LP). These policies aim to ensure that development complements the original building, is compatible with local character and its context and minimises harm to local residents. The appeal scheme is also at odds with the Council's SPG and the National Planning Policy Framework, which notes that development should respond to local character, add to the overall qualities of an area, and secure a good standard of amenity for all occupiers of land and buildings.

Other matters

9. The appellant states that the proportions of the design are under that which would normally be expected within permitted development. Whether or not the proposal would qualify as permitted development, planning permission is sought and I have assessed the scheme as determined by the Council.
10. The appellant states that the scheme has been discussed with a neighbouring owner and I note that the occupier of No 6 supports the proposal. These considerations do not alter my findings in relation to the effect of the new

development on the occupiers of No 2 or in relation to the character and appearance of the local area.

11. The proposal would provide additional living accommodation at ground floor level, which would enhance the living conditions of the appellant and her family. It would also make efficient use of the available space at the rear of the property. Nevertheless, these considerations do not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified in relation to the main issues.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal is not a sustainable form of development and that appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR