



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2019

by S Hunt BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/19/3228142

24 Alfred Road, Feltham TW13 5DJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Kenny Cathro of London Diocesan Fund against the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref P/2019/0683 00028/24/P2, is dated 19 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Two storey extension to the rear, providing improved kitchen and extended family living accommodation to the ground floor and additional bedroom and improved sanitary accommodation to the first floor'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two storey rear extension and the installation of a window at first floor side to the house at 24 Alfred Road, Feltham TW13 5DJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2019/0683 00028/24/P2, dated 19 February 2019, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed below :

Site and Location Plan	4468 (1) 001 A
Floor Plans	3368 (3) 001 B
Elevations	4468 (3) 002 A
 - 3) The first floor side window shall be permanently fitted with opaque glazing, and no additional windows or other glazed openings shall be formed in the side walls of the extension hereby approved.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council altered the description of the development to read 'Erection of a two storey rear extension and the installation of a window at first floor side to the house'. This is more precise than that given on the application form and appeal form therefore I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.
3. The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision

on an application for planning permission. The Council's two putative reasons for refusal are set out in their statement.

4. The appellant has submitted additional plans 4468 (1) 002 A and 4468 (3) 001 B and 4468 (3) 004 which I have accepted as part of the evidence as they do not alter the development as submitted for the planning application and upon which the Council carried out consultations. The plans provide clarification of the roof plan and include labelling of dimensions and angles.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are:

- The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property; and
- The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupier at no. 20 Alfred Road with particular reference to overbearing impact, outlook and loss of privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance of the existing property

6. 24 Feltham Road is a traditional part render and part brick two storey detached dwelling with a slate hipped roof. It has an existing single storey flat roof extension to the rear and sits within a reasonably sized plot. The proposed part single and part two storey rear extension would span the entire width of the property. The first floor element would be smaller in width and depth than the single storey projection below.
7. The Council has adopted a Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Extension Guidelines' 2017 (SPD) which sets out design guidance for householders. It includes guidelines for the scale of rear extensions to detached houses. It requires two storey extensions to be proportionate and subordinate to the main house. It also suggests that the width of a first floor rear extension should be no greater than half the width of the original house, with the depth projecting no more than 2.5 metres. In terms of position, it requires the first floor to be set a minimum of 2 metres from the original side wall of a neighbouring property and set off the shared boundary with the adjoining property as far as possible.
8. In terms of its scale, the single storey extension would meet the SPD guidelines as it would not exceed 4.25 metres in depth. The depth of the two storey extension would exceed the 2.5 metres guideline by a small amount. In respect of the impact on the host property, this is inconsequential. Due to its subordinate design, the size and scale of the extension would not dominate the existing dwelling nor detract from it.
9. The design of the extension would respect the character and appearance of the existing property. It would have a hipped slate roof to match the profile of the existing house and matching materials, a mixture of rendered pebbledash and brick. The detailing, including the fenestration and ridge tiles, would sensitively respond to the existing dwelling.
10. The proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and as such would comply with Policy SC7

of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 which expects proposals to have regard to the quality, character, materials and scale of the principal building and to be subordinate to it. It is also consistent with policies CC1 and CC2 which seek to secure development that responds sensitively to the site and to carefully consider external appearance through the use of high quality, durable materials and finishes with carefully considered detailing. I also find the proposals to be in general conformity with the design guidance set out in the SPD and section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in terms of achieving well designed places.

Living Conditions

11. Paragraph 7 above sets out the guidelines within the SPD in relation to two storey rear extensions. The neighbour at no. 20 has a two storey rear extension with a ground floor window facing the boundary. The side wall of the proposed extension would be positioned some 4.3 metres from here. The depth of the extension would exceed that set out in the SPD by only a small amount. A reasonable distance would remain between the two properties, which are both detached.
12. Whilst there would be some enclosure to the area between the two extensions, it would affect the outlook to a limited degree from the windows here. In my view this would not result in any significant harm to the living conditions of the neighbour. The side window of no.20 already faces a fence and the existing rear extension of no. 24. The occupiers would continue to enjoy an uninterrupted outlook from the remaining rear windows of their extension, and their main rear garden would be unaffected.
13. I have had regard to the neighbours' concerns about overlooking however I do not consider their living conditions would be harmed in this respect. Only one side window is proposed, within the existing house. This would serve a bathroom and a condition could ensure that it is opaque glazed. There would be normal oblique angled views from the first floor windows of the extension towards neighbouring gardens, and indeed this is the case with the existing property.
14. The proposed development would not result in any significant harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupier at no. 20 Alfred Road in terms of overbearing effects, impact on outlook or loss of privacy. It would conform with the provisions of Policy SC7 which expects proposals to minimise harm to neighbouring residents, and policy CC2(f) which seeks for proposals to provide adequate outlook and ensure sufficient sunlight to adjacent dwellings, together with the design guidance set out in the SPD and paragraph 127(f) of the Framework.

Other Matters

15. Fittings such as gutters and downpipes, extractors and gas outlets are a necessary feature of new development. Some already exist to the side elevation of the existing dwelling which faces No. 20. These features are minor and alone they would not require planning consent. Fumes, smells and light pollution would be no greater than they would be for the existing dwelling and are not matters which would justify a rejection of the proposals.

16. There is no evidence that the proposed extension would result in additional traffic or parking pressures over and above that which results from the existing dwelling.
17. Personal circumstances and the occupation of any potential future occupants of the dwelling are not planning considerations that have any bearing on my decision.

Conditions and Conclusion

18. I have undertaken some minor editing of the Council's conditions for precision and clarity. I have attached a standard time limit condition and a condition specifying the relevant plans to provide certainty.
19. The Council have suggested a condition requiring matching materials however this is unnecessary as the approved plans adequately detail the materials. As a bathroom window is shown on the plans, I have altered the Council's condition to specify that the proposed first floor side window should be opaque glazed, in the interests of the living conditions of neighbours.
20. In view of the above considerations and all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted.

S Hunt
Inspector