
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 June 2019

by Rebecca McAndrew BA Hons, PG Dip Urban Design, MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/18/3216807
51 Grove Crescent, Feltham TW13 6NB

- 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 and Mrs Kanda against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00524/51/P5, dated 14 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 23 October 2018.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension and part single, part double storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have also dealt with another appeal on this site (reference APP/F5540/D/18/3216806). That appeal is the subject of a separate decision.
3. At my site visit I saw works had commenced within the rear garden. The existing drawings clearly show the situation on site prior to these works being undertaken and therefore I have assessed the development on the basis of the plans determined by the Council.

Main Issues

4. The main issues in this appeal are;
 - The effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring residential properties, Nos. 49 and 53 Grove Crescent, with particular regard to loss of light and outlook; and
 - The effect on the character and appearance of the existing property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

Living conditions

5. No.49 Grove Crescent sits at an angle to the site and would therefore look directly at the proposed development. The proposed structure would be located on the joint boundary and, at the closest point, would be around 7 metres from the rear elevation of the neighbouring property. I acknowledge that previously there was a single storey structure and a canopy at the site, in the area where the extension would be constructed. I also note the proposed

single storey element of the proposal would only be slightly higher and deeper than these original structures. However, given the position of the proposed extension, the combined mass and bulk of the proposed two storey and single storey elements would be visually obtrusive and overbearing from the neighbouring occupier's dwelling and rear garden. Whilst the neighbour's outbuilding would obscure views of part of the ground floor of the proposed extension, this would not reduce the overall harm which I have described to the neighbour's outlook.

6. The single storey element of the proposed rear extension would be 6 metres deep on the joint boundary with adjoining property, No.53 Grove Crescent. However, given that this structure would only extend around 1 metre deeper than that neighbour's adjoining single storey extension, it would not significantly intrude into the outlook from that property or significantly reduce the level of light that it would receive. Consequently, the scheme would not harm the neighbour's living conditions and the relationship between the proposed scheme and No.53 is acceptable.
7. Whilst I find the proposal would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No.53, this does not outweigh the harm the scheme would have upon the living conditions of the occupiers of No.49. Therefore, taken as a whole, the proposal would be contrary to Policy SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015) (the Local Plan) which seeks to safeguard the living conditions of existing residents.

Character and appearance

8. I acknowledge that the proposed side extension would sit comfortably within the context of the original dwelling and surrounding area. I also note the rear extension would not be widely visible from the public realm. However, the combined mass and scale of the proposed rear extensions would result in an overly dominant structure, which would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Local Plan Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 which, taken together, seek to achieve high quality design which complements the original dwelling and retains the character of the area.

Other Matters

9. I have considered other examples of two storey extensions in the area cited by the appellant and I have also had regard to the extant consents to extend the property. However, each proposal must be considered on its own merit. As such, I have found the appeal proposal would result in significant harm in respect of the two main issues, as I have previously set out.

Conclusion

10. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would indicate that the appeal should be allowed. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR