



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 June 2019

by Rebecca Thomas MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/19/3223997

11 Kings Road, Feltham TW13 5AU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Emma Luxton against the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00664/11/P1, dated 15 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 12 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is the Erection of a piggy back style roof extension to the rear roof of a detached property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a piggy back style roof extension to the rear roof of a detached property at 11 Kings Road, Feltham TW13 5AU in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 00664/11/P1, dated 15 October 2018, 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: Drawing numbers 399-101, 399-102, 399-103, 399-104 and 399-105.
 - 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 Issues

1. The main issues to be considered are the effects of the proposed development on: i) the character and appearance of the area and the building; and ii) the living conditions of neighbouring residents at 13 Kings Road in terms of light and outlook.

Reasons

2. The appeal site is a detached two storey Victorian dwelling in Kings Road with a gable frontage and barge board details with a bay window to the ground floor. It is constructed of red brick with tan bricks to the side and detailing to the front elevation. The building has an existing rear two storey outrigger and the development would make use of this as well as the existing footprint for the extensions.

3. The proposed development would increase the height of the existing dwelling by raising the roof to the rear element and the outrigger element. This is a large extension of the property which makes use of the existing built form. The resultant development would have varied ridgelines, with the original front element being retained and the extended roof starting 4m to the rear of the front elevation. The middle extension would be the highest point and the rear stepped down from that.
4. Policy SC7 of the Local Plan (2015) deals specifically with residential extensions and alterations. It states that the extension and improvement of residential properties will be supported so long as the character of the area is maintained, there is no harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupants and there is no harm to the built environment. Whilst the extensions proposed are sizeable, the design takes its cues from the existing dwelling, matching the pitch of the existing roofslope. It also respects the original dwelling, with the front element of the roof largely untouched. The set-back of the extension would allow the original building to retain its character and appearance, whilst enabling the extension of the property. Although the development is substantial in size, it does not diminish the size of the garden or the plot of the appeal site. Therefore, the proposed extension would comply with the requirements of Policy SC7.
5. I have also had regard to the Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (SPD) which explains that roof extensions can have a big impact on the appearance of a house and the surrounding area. The SPD states that the size of the extension should be secondary to the size of the roof face within which it would be set. However, there are no direct guidelines on piggy back extensions. Nonetheless, as described above, the set-back of the proposed roof extension would enable the extension to remain subordinate to the main roof.
6. The proposed development would not be easily visible from the street. Due to the proposed set back of the extended ridge, views of the proposed extension would be glimpsed only. I have also taken into account the proximity of the other neighbouring buildings which would also limit views along the street of the extension. Given the set-back of the extensions, the development would appear as subordinate to the original as seen from the street, notwithstanding the increase in height.
7. The original features of the dwelling would be retained, in particular those to the front elevation of the property. The overall form of the building would not be affected, and its contribution to the character and appearance of the street would not be weakened. The street contains a variety of dwellings, some of which have been altered over time. The immediately neighbouring properties to both sides are semi-detached properties with hipped gable fronts. I have also taken into account example extensions provided by the appellant. Notwithstanding the overall mass and scale of the development, I do not consider that the proposed development would be harmful to the character or appearance of the streetscene.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the appeal property and the area. Therefore, there is no conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Local Plan and the SPD which expect new development to provide high quality design and protects

the special qualities, context and character of places and to ensure schemes function well and have a positive impact on the amenity of current and future residents.

Living conditions

9. The Council raises concern about the impact to the living conditions of number 13 adjacent to the appeal site. The proposed extension follows the existing built form of the building and there would be no extension beyond the rear walls of the dwelling, merely the dwelling would be extended upwards. The appeal dwelling currently forms a boundary with number 13.
10. The Council refers to a bathroom window to the first floor and a kitchen window to the ground floor. Given the use of the bathroom window and the positioning of the ground floor window, I am not persuaded that the additional height to the neighbouring, appeal, property would exacerbate any issues of loss of light or harm to outlook which may already exist.
11. Therefore, I find no conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 which expect that the amenity of neighbouring properties are protected through high quality design.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard timescale for implementation condition, it is necessary to attach a condition confirming the approved drawings in the interests of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition to ensure that the external materials as would match the existing.

Conclusion

13. I have found that there is no harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling nor to the local area. There would be no harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring properties as a result of the development. I therefore conclude that, subject to the above conditions, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be allowed.

Rebecca Thomas

INSPECTOR