



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 23 November 2020

by Rachel Walmsley MSc, MA, BSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3252896
31 Meadow Way, Hounslow, TW5 9EY

- 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 C Sekhon against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00753/31/P3, dated 15 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is proposed extensions, ground floor rear extension with part 2 storey rear and side extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. At the time of my site visit, the development proposed existed on site. I have based my decision on what I saw on site, together with the submitted plans and details.
3. For clarity, the porch, rear outbuilding and roof extension are not the subject of the development applied for and appealed against. They are not, therefore, for consideration as part of this appeal.

Main Issues

4. These are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with regard to outlook.

Reasons

5. The ground and first floor rear extensions exceed the depths recommended in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (SPD). Combined with their width, each exceeding half the width of the original dwelling, the rear extensions, individually and together, appear unduly large and overly dominant in relation to the more modest form and scale of the host dwelling. As a result, the development appears disproportionate and incongruous when viewed from outside the site and so overall, causes harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. The alley to the side of the site has little bearing on these findings, other than to expose the development to wider views.

6. Some of the properties nearby have been enlarged with extensions. However, these instances are not so numerous and prominent to form a defining feature of the area for the development proposed to be considered acceptable.
7. The appellant refers to an acceptable distance of 4 metres for a ground floor rear extension plus 60 sqm of garden space but it is not clear where these figures have been taken from. The evidence before me leads to the SPD which sets out the size of development that the Council considers acceptable. It is in light of this that I have found harm.
8. From the living area at No 29, views are possible down the garden of this property, from a window that is close to the ground floor extension which extends above the height of the shared boundary. Given that the window allows views down the garden, any views of the extension from the internal living area at No 29 would be at an oblique angle. As such, the development would not create a sense of enclosure to be considered harmful to living conditions.
9. The two-storey side extension is modest in size compared with the scale of the host property. Furthermore, being set down from the ridge line of the host dwelling and set back from its front elevation, the extension appears subservient in form and scale. Similarly, whilst at ground floor the development continues the front building line, it has a negligible effect on the overall form of the property or the dwelling's appearance in the street.
10. All in all, whilst material harm would not be caused to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with regard to outlook, there is notable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The development is therefore contrary to policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Local Plan (2015) and the SPD which seek, amongst other things, extensions that complement the original building and maintain and integrate with the character of the area.

Conclusion

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

R Walmsley

INSPECTOR