



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2017

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16th October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3181310

4 Newgate Close, Feltham TW13 5LG

- 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 Ms Siobhan Ritchings against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00796/4/P1, dated 28 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 27 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension and a part single/part double storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached two storey house. As well as a small rear extension, the house contains a single storey extension which projects down the side of the house and is slightly set in from the side boundary. This boundary is positioned close to a communal parking area with the neighbouring property at No 6 well set back, so that an aspect is afforded from the streetscene over the side and towards the rear of the site. Newgate Close itself consists of a pleasing and relatively uniform arrangement of semi-detached properties that are set in a horseshoe pattern around the parking area and an area of open space.
4. The proposed two storey side extension would be flush with the front elevation of the existing house and to the same height as the main roof pitch. It would also project well beyond the rear elevation of the existing house. The Council's Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Guidance (2003) (SPG) states that two storey side extensions should remain secondary in their size and appearance. By extending the line of the existing front elevation wall without a set-back and with the lack of a vertical break in the roof plane, as well as with its substantial length, the extension would not appear secondary. With its overall size and proportions, the width of less than half the existing house would not significantly alter that the extension would not allow the original proportions of the house to remain the obvious feature.

5. The existing house is prominent when viewed from the parking and open space area, and this is further emphasised by its positioning on the site forward of the house at No 6. The guidance in the SPG which states that a front set back may not be required where houses are staggered is of limited weight because this applies where the neighbour's property projects well in front of the extension; the opposite situation is apparent with the appeal site because the neighbour's property is set well back.
6. The substantial size of the extension, with the positioning of the existing house in relation to No 6, would thus significantly reduce the aspect to the side of the house from the streetscene. Consequently, the extension would appear dominant in this prominent location. The flat roofed element would be well set back and thus would not substantially reduce its prominence.
7. The extension would also notably disrupt the prevailing character which arises from the horseshoe arrangement of properties. With the forward positioning of the existing house, the extension would appear as an incongruous addition. The distance the side wall of the extension would be set back from the side boundary would be limited with the extended roofline near abutting this boundary. As such, this would not serve to significantly reduce its prominent siting but would emphasise the mass and bulk of an inappropriate addition. Whereas the SPG states that two storey side extensions should be set in from the boundary by 0.3m, this is in the context of the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property. In contrast, the main issue which concerns this extension is the effect on character and appearance, and this is where the harm arises.
8. I conclude that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the building and the area. As such, it would not comply with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 -2030 (2015) (Local Plan) which state that development proposals will be expected to conserve and take opportunities to enhance particular qualities which contribute to an area, respond meaningfully and sensitively to the site, and that extensions should maintain the character of the area and complement the existing building.
9. For the reasons I have set out, I also find the proposal does not comply with the SPG. Although the SPG is dated compared to the Local Plan, its guidance remains broadly applicable and, in any case, I have found the proposal does not comply with the policies in the Local Plan. Whilst paragraph 59 of the National Planning Policy Framework does state that design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription and detail, paragraph 60 makes it clear that it is proper to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness. The proposal fails to achieve this with the harm that arises to character and appearance.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Darren Hendley

INSPECTOR