



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2019

by R E Jones BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/19/3229258
22 Sunbury Way, Feltham TW13 6XJ

- 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 S Srai against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01081/22/P7, dated 17 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is described as 2 storey side extension including change of use 1 x bed dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description on the application form refers to the proposed development being 'a change of use 1 x bed dwelling'. However, the proposal relates to the creation of a new dwelling rather than a change of use. I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are: (i) The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area generally, (ii) The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbours, with particular regard to outlook and daylight; and (iii) the effect of the proposal on highway safety, with regard to parking provision.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site, a semi-detached dwelling, is located in a suburban street amongst dwellings of the same style, scale and design detailing. Dwellings here largely have hipped roofs and brick chimney stacks and are primarily rendered. They follow a consistent building line set back from the highway and there is roughly equal spacing between properties. As a result, the dwellings on the street have a regular rhythm, are attractively designed, and in addressing the street scene, make a positive contribution to it.
5. By incorporating a hipped roof, window openings and materials to match, the proposal is consistent in this regard with the main dwelling. However, it lacks

sufficient subordination to the main dwelling as the proposed ground floor is not set back from the existing front elevation, while only a modest set back of approximately 0.5 metres is provided at the first floor, falling short of the 1 metre requirement in the Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted 20 December 2017) (SPD). The effect of this would elongate the host dwelling, diminish the original proportions, whilst also unbalancing the pair of semi-detached dwellings it would relate to. These all combine to have an unacceptable impact upon the character and appearance of No.22 Sunbury Way (No 22).

6. The proposed extension would extend right up to the boundary of No 23 Sunbury Way (No 23) at a point. However, the separation distance increases slightly by virtue of the tapered alignment of the boundary. The effect of the proposal would therefore be to significantly limit the present gap between No.22 and No.23, such that it would result in a harmful terracing effect that weakens the architectural understanding of this pair of semi-detached dwellings in the street, in addition to disrupting the uniform pattern of development.
7. For all of these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptable detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the surrounding area. As a consequence, it would be contrary to Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (LBHLP), and the SPD, which taken together, require development to respond to and maintain the character of the area, promote high quality urban design and architecture to create attractive and distinctive places, compliment and be subordinate to the original dwelling and have regard to standards in design guidance.

Living conditions

8. The proposed extension would project approximately 3 metres beyond the rear elevation of the host dwelling and extend right up to the newly formed boundary between the existing and proposed dwellings. Because of its height, bulk and closeness to the garden area and dining room window of No.22, the proposal would be oppressive and overwhelming, such that it would lead to a loss of outlook and a sense of enclosure when viewed from this space. As well as being visually intrusive, the proposal's excessive projection and close siting will cast a shadow on the amenity area and dining room of No.22, leading to an unacceptable loss of daylight. Similarly, the immediacy of the extension to the neighbouring boundary and property at No.23 would have an overpowering presence when viewed from its garden area resulting in a loss of outlook and an unacceptable sense of enclosure. Furthermore, the proposal will occupy an area that would diminish the amount of daylight No 23's garden would receive to an unacceptable degree.
9. Taking all these matters into account, I conclude that the proposal would result in a harmful loss of light and outlook to the occupiers of Nos 22 and 23 Sunbury Way. This would unacceptably harm living conditions, contrary to Policies CC2 and SC7 of the LBHLP, and the SPD. These policies, amongst other matters, require development to have a positive impact on the amenity of residents and seek to ensure development minimises harm to neighbouring residents in terms of unacceptable loss of daylight and outlook or by creating an unacceptable sense of enclosure.

Highway safety

10. The parking space allocated for the proposed dwelling would be accessed via the existing entrance to the property and will necessitate a new dropped kerb and access into the forecourt, for existing cars associated with No 22. This would require a separate consent from the Council, but I note the effect of which would be to remove up to two on street parking bays in an area of limited parking bay provision.
11. This could therefore lead to additional pressure to park illegally at restricted areas close to junctions and the nearby hatched bus stopping areas causing danger to other vehicles using the highway. During my early morning site visit I noted that there is already a limited amount of on street parking bays in the area. Although there is a large length of unrestricted street space on the opposite side of the road, I consider that parking here would reduce the carriageway width to the extent that it would result in obstructions and difficulties for two vehicles to pass each other safely on opposite sides of the road.
12. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a detrimental effect on highway safety. The scheme would therefore run contrary to Policy EC2 of the LBHLP and the Residential Crossovers and Off-Street Parking Policy, which amongst other considerations requires the provision of new parking to meet crossover standards and maintain highway safety.

Other matters

13. The appellant is of the view that the proposal meets the required space standards, represents high quality design and is consistent in terms of materials with the main dwelling. However, there are fundamental concerns in respect of the proposal's design for the reasons outlined above, and these outweigh the positive effects of the matching materials and compliance with space standards.
14. I have considered the proposal in light of national and local planning policy which seeks to boost housing supply, and the site's accessibility to public transport. However, while the proposal may align with certain aspects of planning policy, I have found conflict with the development plan as a whole. With regard to favourable public transport proximity, there is no refusal reason relating to this and I find this to be a neutral factor that does not weigh in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R. E. Jones

INSPECTOR