
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2021

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 1 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3263600
50 Blossom Waye, Hounslow TW5 9HD

- 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 Harnek Sidhu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00126/50/P8, dated 2 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is an infill ground floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the house and the street-scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this 2 storey detached house which is located at the junction of Blossom Waye with The Vale. The surrounding residential area contains mainly semi-detached houses with some detached properties and some bungalows; the properties share a number of similar design features.
4. The existing house has a single storey addition to its rear which is the same width as the original house and a single storey side extension which is the same depth as the original house. The proposal is to fill the rectangular space partly enclosed by the rear of the side extension and the side of the rear extension. The proposal would have its flank wall set immediately adjacent to the boundary of the plot with The Vale.
5. The Council has referred to its Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) '*Residential Extensions Guidelines*' which they adopted in December 2017. Amongst many other things, it refers to single storey side extensions within section 4.4. It states that at corner plots extra care needs to be taken for proposed side extensions due to their exposed location; in such cases a set in from the side boundary may be required to reduce the impact of the addition, any wrap around proposal that connects a side extension to a rear extension on a corner plot will be refused.

6. The existing boundary is formed by a brick wall which is connected to the wall of the side extension. From the street the form of the house is obvious, notwithstanding the boundary wall. There is a clear visual separation between the side and rear extensions and the form of the original house is clearly discernible. The proposal would be clearly visible within the street-scene, again, notwithstanding the boundary wall. It would have a considerable visual effect being so close to the boundary and it would make the combination of extensions appear dominant when compared to the original form of the house. Whilst the existing extensions appear subordinate and allow the form of the original house to prevail, visually, the proposal would result in the loss of this impression and would dominate the house unacceptably, contrary to the Council's SPD.
7. I have considered the other examples of development in the area that the appellant has referred to and saw these at my site visit. These were built prior to the Council's SPD and the Local Plan 2015 – 2030 and in my view demonstrate that such extensions can harm the surroundings. I also disagree with the appellant and do not find the existing gap to be unsightly and I do not consider that the proposal would enhance the area.
8. As a result of my findings, I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the surrounding area. As a consequence, it is contrary to Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Local Plan and the provisions of the SPD. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR