
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3rd December 2019

by William Walton BA MSc Dip Env Law LLM CPE BVC MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/19/3236360
418 Bath Road, Hounslow TW4 7RP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Swati Chavda against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00083/418/P2, dated 6 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is a first-floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. During my site visit I noted a roof dormer on the top floor which was not shown on the plans and which appeared to have been recently installed. I am not aware if this addition has the benefit of planning permission.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a conventional semi-detached dwelling located on a principal arterial route in west London. Although the front elevations of most of the properties have changed little, many appear to have been subject to extensive alterations at the rear. No. 418 Bath Road includes a ground floor rear extension which extends the width of the dwelling and projects out about 6 metres.
5. The proposed development comprises, first, a first-floor extension with a flat roof at the rear of the property above the existing ground floor extension and, second, the installation of a new window on the side of the first floor looking towards the side elevation of No. 420 Bath Road. According to the plans the extension would measure approximately 4 metres in width, 3 metres in depth and just under 2 metres in height. It would be set back about 3 metres from the end of the ground floor extension and would be set in about 2 metres from the shared boundary with No. 416 Bath Road.
6. In order to ensure that no harm is created to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area the Council advises in its

Residential Extension Guidelines: Supplementary Planning Document – A Guide for Householders 2017 (SPD) that first floor rear extensions should be proportionate and subordinate to the dimensions of the dwelling. Extensions should generally be no more than half the width of the house, should project no further than 2.5 metres from beyond the rear wall and should be at least 2 metres from the shared boundary with an adjacent dwelling.

7. The proposed extension exceeds the guideline width by approximately 1 metre. It also exceeds the advised depth by around 0.5 metre. With these points in mind and having looked at the property and its surroundings during my site visit, I do not believe that the proposed extension would be proportionate or subordinate to the original dwelling. Instead, because of its size, I consider that it would be bulky, incongruous and unsympathetic to the host dwelling and the neighbouring area.
8. I note that the extension of the neighbouring property is quite large, but my understanding is that this was constructed prior to the adoption of the current local plan and the accompanying residential extension guidelines. Consequently, I do not consider the neighbouring extension provides any form of precedent that could be relevant in determining this appeal.
9. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the proposed extension and side window would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the neighbouring area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy CC1(a) of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 2015 (HLP) which seeks to ensure that new development properly respects its context. It would also be contrary to Policy CC2 (k) of the HLP which seeks to ensure that new development protects the character of the site and surrounding area and would be contrary to Policy SC7 (a) and (e) of the HLP which seeks to ensure that new development takes recognition of relevant design guidelines and respects neighbouring buildings.
10. Finally, the proposal would not accord with the advice set out in section 4.6 of the Council's SPD. Since these guidelines have been introduced to give effect to the HLP I give considerable weight to them.

Other Matters

11. I consider that the Council properly applied the specifics of the proposal against its own set of development plan policies and supplementary guidelines. I note that the application was amended, but nonetheless I have found that the proposal would still be unduly large and out of place and thus contrary to the Council's various design policies and its guidance on residential extensions.
12. Finally, whilst I have had regard to the fact that there appear to have been other extensions constructed in the neighbourhood which might be as large, or larger, than what is proposed in this case, I do not consider that these constitute a precedent in determining my decision. I have determined this appeal on its individual planning merits taking account of up to date and adopted development plan policies.

Conclusions

13. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

William Walton

INSPECTOR