



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 September 2020

by B Davies MSc FGS CGeol

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3251005

55 Wolseley Gardens, Chiswick, London, W4 3LZ

- 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 Mrs A Burns against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01223/55/P3, dated 13 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is ground and first floor rear extension. Two roof lights in ground floor rear extension, bifold/sliding door in ground floor rear extension. One door and one window in ground floor rear extension. New window in existing first floor rear elevation, new windows in proposed first floor extension in the rear and side elevation. Rooflight above en suite in roof of first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an end of terrace house on a large corner plot. The original outrigger is two-storeys high, and wide and shallow relative to others on the host terrace, reflecting the slightly different original configuration of the house. The host house currently has a small, single-storey extension with a sloping roof attached to the rear of the outrigger.
4. The development would be multi-faceted, but the Council have indicated that they have no objection to the single-storey rear extensions or window details. This decision therefore concentrates on the effect of the first-floor rear extension on the character and appearance of the host house and area.
5. The proposal is to add a first-floor extension across nearly half the width of the rear of building, on the opposing side to the original outrigger, to a depth of 6.76 metres. This would result in the narrowest side of the house, which is approximately 5 metres deep, being more than doubled in length at the first-floor level. Section 4.6 of the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) states that the height and width of rear extensions should not project more than 2.5 metres beyond the rear wall.

By more than doubling the depth of the building on this side of the house and significantly exceeding the guidance figure, I do not consider that the development would be subordinate, as required by Policy SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015-2030)(the 'LP').

6. I have noted the appellant's argument that the first-floor extension would not project beyond the rear wall of the extended ground floor and therefore meets the requirements of the SPD. However, although not explicitly stated, when reading this section of the SPD in the context of the previous statement on width, which does refer to the original structure, and given a shared objective to produce proportionate design, I consider that comparison with the existing, rather than proposed structure, is more appropriate.
7. Local roofs are typically pitched and multi-levelled, which add character and architectural interest to both the house and area. The proposed flat roof above the first-floor extension would therefore not be sympathetic to the prevailing character of the area, nor that of the host house. It would result in an incongruent cuboid shape and appear bulky when compared to the pitched lines of the original building, which would cause harm to the character and appearance of the house.
8. The rear outriggers along the terraces produce a characteristic footprint and, at least to some extent, it is desirable to maintain an echo of this structure in local development. The original outrigger would remain, but it would appear as infill between the neighbouring house and the two-storey extension, which means that the fundamental character and footprint of the feature would be lost.
9. The appellant states that the proposal would comply with Policy CC2 (o) of the LP because it would promote and support contemporary architecture, whilst ensuring it is rooted in local context. The structure would undoubtedly present as a modern development, and I appreciate that proposed materials reflect those found locally. However, it is not clear from the information provided that the proposed design takes cues from the local vernacular, and for the reasons above, I do not find the first-floor extension a sympathetic addition in this respect.
10. The first-floor extension would not be easily visible from the public domain and for this reason, I do not consider that it would be harmful to the appearance of the wider area. However, for the reasons above, there would still be harm to the character and appearance of the house itself.
11. I appreciate that the design would have a positive impact on the amenity of the occupants of the house. However, this benefit is insufficient to overcome the harm to the character and appearance of the host building.
12. It is not in dispute that the proposal meets the requirements of Policy CC2 (t) in not being overbearing, causing overshadowing or loss of daylight to the detriment of the living conditions of neighbours. However, in itself this is not sufficient to overcome the harm to character and appearance of the host house identified above.
13. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy SC7 of the LP, which requires that extensions must be subordinate and complement the original building, having regard to the SPG, to avoid harm to the built environment. It also conflicts with

the aims of Policies CC1 and CC2, which require development to respond sensitively to site characteristics and any local architectural vernacular that contributes to an area's character. The harm to the character and appearance of the host building is not overcome by the benefits to the amenity of occupants and lack of harm to the appearance of the area or the amenities of neighbours.

Conclusions

14. For these reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

B Davies

INSPECTOR