
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2017

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16th August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3176782

10 Bridge Road, Hounslow, TW3 1SG

- 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 Aymynali Rashid against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref P/2017/1296, dated 27 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 18 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is a part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension at 10 Bridge Road, Hounslow, TW3 1SG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2017/1296, dated 27 March 2017, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, Drawings KR/01 and KR/02.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the area around Bridge Road.

Reasons

3. No 10 Bridge Road is a small semi-detached house with a narrow, single-storey rear extension that is around 2.5 metres wide and 4 metres in depth. The house has a first floor side extension which it shares with No 8 in the form of a first floor bridge between the two properties. This side extension effectively therefore links a pair of semi-detached houses with a short terrace of houses of similar scale. At ground floor level there is a vehicular access between Nos 8 and 10 into a mainly unsurfaced and untended parking area at the rear, which appears to occupy much of the relatively large rear garden areas to the two houses.
-

4. The proposal would involve the construction of a full-width, single-storey extension at the rear that would be around 4.7 metres in depth. There would be a full-width, first floor extension above this, which would be only some 2.5 metres in depth. The first floor extension would have a hipped roof to match the existing main roof. It would continue the existing eaves line, but it would be significantly lower to ridge level. The Council's officers have indicated that they have no significant concerns regarding the ground floor element of the extension, and that the overall proposal as submitted would not be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring houses by way of light or outlook. I concur with those views. The Council also contends, however, that the proposed first floor extension, by reason of its position, width, size and external appearance, would be an intrusive development, out of scale and character with the prevailing pattern of development in the locality.
5. The northern end of Bridge Road has a wide variety of building sizes, types and uses. There are large commercial properties at the junction of Bridge Road with Roman Road. Nos 2 – 8 comprise a short terrace of small houses. Nos 10 and 12 are a pair of small semi-detached houses, while No 14 is a detached house. Further south there is a large block of flats and then two more short rows of terraced houses. All of the houses in the vicinity of the appeal property have ground floor rear extensions and No 14 would appear to have a sizeable and deep first floor rear extension. There is a flat-roofed, first floor link structure between Nos 8 and 10, which would effectively block any views of the proposed extension at the appeal property from Bridge Road.
6. On the basis of the above, I find that there is no clearly established character to the area around the appeal property. First floor rear and side extensions exist in the immediate vicinity of No 10, and the proposed extension would not feature in the street scene. Whilst it would occupy the whole width of the house, it would be of restricted depth and it would have a low hipped-roof to complement the existing building. It would appear subordinate to the main house and would not be significantly out of scale with the host property, its relatively large rear garden/parking area, or the wider surroundings.
7. In conclusion, therefore, I find that the proposed extension would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the area around Bridge Road, and it would not conflict with Policies CC1 and SC7 of the Council's Local Plan, or with its Residential Extension Guidelines, all of which require development, including residential extensions and alterations, to respect and maintain the context and character of the area.

Conditions

8. I have attached a condition relating to plans because it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have attached a further condition relating to materials in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR