The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2021

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 25 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3257779
28 St Johns Road, Feltham TW13 6NW

- 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 Satveer Singh Sandhu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
- The application Ref 00982/28/P3, dated 12 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 August 2020.
- The development proposed is described as the demolition of the existing garage, an additional single storey rear extension, a double storey side extension and a loft conversion including roof-lights.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this end-of-terrace, 2-storey house which is located within an area of very similar houses. The property is separated from the first house in the next terrace (No 26) by a narrow footpath which leads to the rear of the houses.

4. Policy CC1 of the Council's Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (LP) states that the Council will recognise the context and varied character of the Borough's places and seek to ensure that all new development conserves and takes opportunities to enhance their special qualities and heritage. Policy CC2 of the LP states that the Council will retain, promote and support high quality urban design and architecture to create attractive, distinctive and liveable places. Policy SC7 of the LP set out that the Council will support the extension of residential properties subject to there being no unacceptable effects on neighbours or the built environment; in doing so, the Policy states that regard will be had to the design guidance and standards contained in its Supplementary Planning Documents.

5. The Council has adopted its Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) '*Residential Extension Guidelines'* (December 2017) which sets out detailed guidance and standards for various forms of domestic development. Within

Section 4.5 it includes requirements for 2 storey side extensions which should include the following: a set back at the front of the first floor of a minimum of 1m; the width of the extension should be less than half of the width of the original house and the roof should be set down from the original by at least half a metre. The aim being that such an extension would appear subordinate to the original house.

6. The proposed extension would fail to meet these 3 standards; the first-floor set-back would be around half a metre, the roof ridge would only have a very small set-down and the extension would be about the same width as the original house. As a result of these factors, I consider that the proposed extension would appear unduly large in comparison with the original house. It would fail to appear subordinate and would have an unacceptable visual effect on the house and the street-scene.

7. The appellant has made reference to a number of other extensions within the road, which do not meet the SPD standards and, in some respects are similar to the appeal scheme. I had the opportunity to view these existing extensions at my site visit and they take a variety of forms, including some with set-backs and others without. The Council has indicated that the nearest such extension was constructed prior to the existence of the current policies and SPD. I have no further information in relation to the other extensions including when they were permitted or constructed. Whilst I can understand that the appellant has sought to draw support from the existence of these other extensions, their existence does not automatically indicate that the appeal scheme should be acceptable. There will always be instances where planning policies and guidance evolves, meaning that historic development would not meet newer standards; I see this being the case here. In addition, the form and appearance of some of the extensions is such that I can fully understand the Council's desire to prevent similar forms of extensions.

8. In relation to the proposed alterations at the front including the porch, I consider that this would appear as a continuation of the feature that runs across the front of the whole of the existing terrace and would have no unacceptable visual effects.

9. Overall, I consider that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. As a result, it would be contrary to Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the LP and the detailed guidance within the SPD. I have taken full account of the supporting information set out by the appellant but, for the reasons that I state above, this does not outweigh the harm that would arise. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR