
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 December 2020

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3246072
201 Ellerdine Road, Hounslow TW3 2PZ

- 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 Krishnebavan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00391/201/P4, dated 27 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear conservatory addition onto existing rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The submission stated the application was to retain development. At my site visit, I saw that an extension with the overall proportions comparable to the submitted plans was already in place. However, there were some differences, including in relation to the stepping in of the extension from the boundary with 199 Ellerdine Road. As the site at present does not accord with the appeal scheme, I have dealt with the appeal as a proposed development as shown on the plans.

Main Issues

3. The main issues of the appeal are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - The living conditions of the occupiers of 199 Ellerdine Road, with particular regard to outlook; and
 - The character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living Conditions

4. The proposed extension would be lower than the existing rear projection. Notwithstanding this, the scheme would increase the depth of the built form that is set on, or very close to, the boundary with 199 Ellerdine Road (No 199). Moreover, even with a sloping roof and reflective or lighter coloured cladding, the extension would be a noticeable presence above and beyond the boundary fence and garden vegetation. Some of the ground floor openings are angled

towards the appeal site and the appeal scheme would be obvious from within the property.

5. The height, depth and close proximity of the elongated rear projection would result in it becoming an imposing and dominating feature from No 199. The scheme would create an uninviting outlook, and an increased sense of enclosure, from within No 199.
6. Therefore, the proposed development would unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 199 with regard to outlook. It would fail to accord with Policies CC2 and SC7 of the Local Plan where they require developments to not result in harm to the amenity of neighbouring residents and create liveable spaces. It would also be contrary to the SPD¹ where it seeks to prevent extensions that cause unacceptable enclosure.

Character and Appearance

7. The proposal would extend the rear projection at the appeal property beyond the maximum size stated in the SPD and that of the adjacent properties where it would be clearly visible from. Nonetheless, it would be seen in the context of the varied size, roof form and materials of the rear projections along this part of Ellerdine Road. Moreover, the street does include a similar depth projection to that proposed and from the street the extension would be largely screened.
8. The roof would not follow from the existing rear projection. Nevertheless, it would similarly be sloping in nature. The stepping down of the roof would ensure the extension would appear subservient to the original dwelling.
9. The extension would reduce the outdoor space at the appeal property and bring the built form close to the garage behind. However, there is little consistency in the street to the position of outbuildings and their separation from the dwellings they are associated with. Moreover, while smaller than the adjacent properties, an appropriate area of outdoor space would be retained alongside the garage that the extension would be orientated towards and open onto.
10. There is already a mix of materials at the appeal site and the adjacent plots. Therefore, the use of polycarbonate sheeting would not be harmful. Were the appeal to be allowed a condition could be imposed regarding external materials.
11. Consequently, the proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would accord with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Local Plan. These, in part, require developments to maintain and conserve the character of the area. While it would breach the depth for such extensions set out in the SPD, the scheme would comply with its aims to ensure extensions are secondary to the original house and subservient to the host dwelling.

Other Matters

12. It is suggested that an extension erected under permitted development rights could be taller than the appeal scheme and not have a sloping roof. However, there is no specific design or certificate of lawful development for such a scheme. Consequently, it is not clear what such proposals would entail or what

¹ Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document

effect they would have. The appellant does state that such an extension would be shorter in depth than the appeal scheme. This would reduce the enclosing effect that the length of the built form in the scheme before me would create. Furthermore, there is no guarantee that any potential fallback would be built were the appeal dismissed. While the fallback is a consideration, it does not offer a basis to allow the appeal in light of the concerns above.

Conclusion

13. Therefore, for the reason given above and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR