



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 July 2019

by E Symmons BSc (Hons), MSc

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/19/3229082 88 Whitton Dene, Hounslow TW3 2JU

- 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 Deepak Kapoor against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01203/88/P4, dated 21 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is for a first floor rear and side extension with roof extension and rear dormer loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council has drawn my attention to the Draft London Plan 2017 and reviews of the West of the Borough Local Plan and the Great West Corridor Local Plan Review. Specific policies within these plans have not been referred to within the submitted statements. Additionally, these plans have not been the subject of independent examination. As such I give them little weight within the context of this case.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposals on:
 - the character and appearance of the area, and
 - the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring property with respect to light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. This detached property sits at the end of a group of dwellings within part of Whitton Dene which runs between Millwood Road and Rosebery Road. The properties in the street are mainly semi-detached with pairs of semis being separated by shared driveways which run between the dwellings to give vehicular access to the rear. Although the appeal property and the three adjacent have a slightly different style from the others in the street, they are similar in scale and layout. The appeal property and 86 Whitton Dene which sits adjacent, have both constructed single storey extensions to the side.

Additionally, the appeal property has a single storey rear extension which extends across the full width of the rear elevation.

5. The existing ground floor side extension is recessed from the front elevation and the proposal would bring this building line forward level with the front wall. The first floor side extension would be set back from this new front elevation and have a hipped roof set down from roof ridge height. Both features would give a subordinate appearance and comply with guidance within the Guide for Householders Supplementary Planning Document¹ (SPD). The side element would therefore not harm the character and appearance of the area.
6. The proposed full-width rear extension would sit directly above the existing single storey extension and have a depth of around 4.25m. The pitched roof would be extended out over this and a dormer incorporated. This combination would create a large and bulky structure which would be out of scale with the original house and its neighbours. It would therefore be contrary to the design principles set out in the SPD which seeks that first floor rear extensions are subordinate to the host property, no greater than half the width of the original house and project no more than 2.5m. Although the adjacent tree within the garden of 50 Millwood Road (No 50) screens the rear of the appeal property when in leaf, during the rest of the year the extension would be visible from both Whitton Dene and Millwood Road and due to its incongruous appearance would harm the character and appearance of the area.
7. Concern regarding the effect of the proposal on the mature tree at No 50 has been raised. This tree can be seen from both Whitton Dene and Millwood Road and adds to the character and appearance of the streetscape. The proposal would require substantial pruning of this tree to accommodate both the construction and the ongoing maintenance of the extension. This would have a detrimental effect upon the visual amenity value of the tree and so the character of the area. The pruning would also make the extension more visible during the summer months. Although not determinative, this issue adds weight to my concerns regarding this proposal.
8. Due to the harm to the character and appearance of the area the proposal would conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (Local Plan) which together and amongst other matters seek that development conserves and enhances the quality of the area, has high quality design which complements the original building and those in the area, and considers and retains trees with amenity value.

Living conditions

9. The SPD seeks to protect the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties by ensuring that two-storey extensions are off-set from common boundaries and have a limited projection. The effect of the proposal on 50 Millwood Road during the summer months would be mitigated by the large tree within the garden of this property which would obscure views of the proposed extension. At other times of year however, the extension would be visible through the tree canopy. Although No 50 currently overlooks the appeal property, the scale of the proposal in relation to the current size of the appeal property would have a much greater impact and affect their outlook.

¹ London Borough of Hounslow Supplementary Planning Document. A Guide for Householders. Adopted December 2017.

10. The 4.25m deep, full width proposed extension would be at the property boundary with 90 Whitton Dene (No 90). This neighbouring property has a single storey extension with rooflights and two obscure glazed windows close to the shared boundary. This extension is offset from the common boundary leaving a gap which functions as a patio area adjacent to the house. The appeal property sits to the west of No 90 and the height, mass, orientation and proximity of the proposal would enclose and overshadow the patio and extension having an overbearing impact upon the rear of No 90. The proposal would also affect access to light and sunlight, particularly in the latter part of the day.
11. Although the side extension would not have a detrimental effect upon the occupiers of No 90, the rear part of extension would harm their living conditions with respect to light and its overbearing effect. Similarly, it would also affect the outlook of No 50. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy CC2 and SC7 of the Local Plan. These policies, together and amongst other matters, seek that development has a positive impact upon residents minimising harm to neighbouring occupiers' living conditions.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons stated above the appeal is dismissed

E Symmons

INSPECTOR