



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2021

by G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 February 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3259352
207 Fernside Avenue, Feltham, TW13 7BQ

- 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 Yeshwanth Eluka against the decision of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00442/207/P5, dated 11 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of a first floor rear extension to include the removal of 2x windows and insertion of 1x new window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on: a) the character and appearance of the area; and b) the living conditions of existing neighbouring occupiers.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. Paragraph 3.2 of the Hounslow Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (December 2017) (SPD) confirms that new extensions should seek to complement the original building, harmonise with adjoining properties, maintain the character of the streetscene and maintain the character/value of private spaces, including rear gardens. Extensions should be subordinate to the host property and should not be seen to dominate. The approach set out in the SPD is consistent with Policy SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan (September 2015) (HLP), which, amongst other policies, the SPD specifically seeks to expand on and support.
4. Against this background, the proposed extension would not be subordinate to the host property. It would be out of proportion and would dominate the appearance of the rear of the host property as a result of its scale and bulk. This finding is exacerbated by the proposed design, which includes a large flat roof at first floor level that would sit uncomfortably below the existing large roof extension at second floor level. The end result is a disjointed collection of extensions that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

5. Paragraph 4.6 of the SPD states that first floor extensions should project no more than 2.5 metres from the main rear wall of the host property and extend no more than half the width of the original house. Although the proposed extension is set back on the boundary with 205 Fernside Avenue (No.205), it would extend the full width, with the majority of the extension projecting 3.7 metres from the main back wall of the host property. As a consequence, the proposal, combined with previous extensions, would overwhelm the original proportions of the house. As I observed on my site visit, the rear of appeal site is visible from neighbouring properties, where the proposed extension would appear out of keeping and overbearing, resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the area.
6. For the reasons given above, I consider that the proposed extension would be contrary to Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the HLP and paragraphs 3.2 and 4.6 of the SPD. Combined, these seek to conserve local character, secure opportunities to enhance character, promote high quality design and ensure that extensions are proportionate and subordinate to the original house.

Living conditions

7. Paragraph 4.6 of the SPD seeks to restrict the projection and width of first floor extensions due to the negative impact larger extensions can have on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. The guidance states that first floor extensions should be set back from the shared boundary with adjoining properties as much as possible and restricted so that they project no more than 2.5 metres from the main rear wall. Whilst I accept that the proposed extension has been designed to meet the 45° angle (taken from the first floor rear window of No.205), the majority of the new extension projects 3.7 metres from the main back wall and would, as a consequence, have a significant impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 205.
8. As I observed on site, whilst No.205 has a ground floor extension it is set well back from the rearmost wall of the existing ground floor extension to the host property. In view of this and even with the initial set back of the new extension at first floor level, the proposal would result in an unacceptable sense of enclosure and would be overbearing to the occupiers of No.205, particularly from their immediate private amenity area and existing ground and first floor windows.
9. I find therefore that the impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.205 would be unacceptable and that the proposal fails to comply with Policies CC2 and SC7 of the HLP, and paragraph 4.6 of the SPD. These seek to ensure that new extensions have a positive impact on and do not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Conclusions

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Roberts

INSPECTOR