
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 October 2019

by David Murray BA (Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/19/3237429

78 Wood Lane, Isleworth, London, TW7 5EA.

- 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 A Reddy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref. 01225/78/P1, dated 2 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, and
 - the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Reasons

Background

3. The appeal site comprises a two storey semi-detached property which lies in a residential area of similar properties. No.76 is the attached property and No.80 lies on the other side of a narrow driveway in between. It is proposed to demolish the existing veranda and erect a single storey extension at the rear of the property. This would extend to 6m and be about 2.66m to the eaves and 3.3m to the top of a truncated pitched roof with roof tiles on the outer slope and a flat roof in the centre. In assessing the proposal I have taken account of the fact that the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, as amended, allows in general terms a rear extension up to 6m in length to a semi-detached property subject to a neighbour notification process.

Character and appearance

4. As the proposed extension lies to the rear of the main property, the structure would hardly be noticeable to the public realm and would not be prominent in the street scene. Although the structure would have a basic flat roof form, part

of the appearance of this design would be mitigated by the low pitch roof in matching tiles which would be present on the side and rear elevations. As such the proposed extension would not be an alien feature when seen in the private views from other rear gardens. The Council says that there are no other extensions of the size proposed in the locality, but this is not a test of whether the proposal is visually acceptable as the effect will depend on the actual local impact. Moreover, I disagree with the Council over the scale of the extension and find that its scale and form are subordinate to those characteristics of the main original dwelling.

5. Overall on this issue, I am satisfied that the proposal meets the requirements of parts (a) and (g) of Local Plan Policy SC7 as it would, primarily, maintain the character of the area, even though there would be limited conflict with the local Supplementary Planning Document on Residential Extensions as this puts forward a general restriction on the length of extensions.

Effect on living conditions

6. In terms of living conditions, the Council submits that the length and height of the extension would create an unacceptable sense of enclosure for the neighbours, damage outlook and block light from gardens and rear windows.
7. At my site visit, I noted that the attached property No.76 has a single storey projecting rear extension which has a three element window facing towards the garden and this is said to light a kitchen. The proposal would extend about 2.5m beyond this. In my view the degree of the further projection proposed, coupled with the height of the extension close to the party boundary, would have a harmful effect by reducing outlook and causing a loss of light to the window and the adjacent garden area. I find that the occupiers of this property would suffer a distinct feeling of enclosure and being 'boxed in'. The occupiers of the property also raise objection to the loss of view from their property but control over private views over other private land is beyond the normal scope of the planning system.
8. Concerning the relationship with No.80 there is a gap of about 2.8m between this property and the appeal site house and No.80 is already much extended including a single storey ground floor rear facing addition. I am satisfied that the proposed extension would not project out much further than this existing one bearing in mind the gap that exists.
9. I conclude on this issue that the extension put forward is of a length and height that would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.76 Wood Lane. Therefore, the proposal does not meet the requirements of part (f) of Local Plan Policy SC7 nor the specific standard set out in the Residential Extension Guidelines as mentioned above.

Planning balance

10. Bringing together my conclusions on the main issues I have found that the scale and design of the proposed extension is subservient to that of the host property and the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of this or the wider area. However, the proposal would harm the living conditions of neighbours at No.76 because of the adverse effect on the outlook and available light to this kitchen of this property and the adjoining garden. This harm and conflict with the development plan is not outweighed by the benefits of the

scheme and the improvement to the appellants property and this indicates that planning permission should not be granted.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Murray

INSPECTOR