



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 February 2021

by G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 March 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3258995

464 Redford Close, Feltham, TW13 4TP

- 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 Joeldo Menezes against the decision of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01683/464/P1, dated 20 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is double storey rear extension and conversion of an existing garage into a habitable space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Appellant has raised concerns over the Council's handling of the application, and, in particular, their failure to work pro-actively to bring forward an acceptable design. This is a matter that would need to be taken up with the Council, in the first instance. In determining this appeal, I have only had regard to the planning merits of the case and have considered the proposal on its individual merits.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

Living conditions

4. Paragraph 4.6 of the Hounslow Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (December 2017) (SPD) seeks to restrict the projection and width of two storey rear extensions due to the negative impact larger extensions can have on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. The paragraph continues by stating that the ground floor section of a two storey rear extension should follow the same principles as those set out in paragraph 4.3. This aspect of the appeal proposal would accord with the latter, in that it would project less than 3.05 metres from the main rear wall of the host

property and would appear secondary to the original house, even though it would extend the full width of the ground floor.

5. With regard to the proposed first floor element, paragraph 4.6 of the SPD states that such extensions should be subordinate to and be no greater than half the width of the original house. In addition, to avoid a sense of enclosure and loss of light, first floor extensions should be set back a minimum of 2 metres from the original side or shared wall of the neighbouring property, and project no more than 2.5 metres from the main rear wall. Whilst I accept that the first floor of the proposed extension has been designed to project no more than 2.5 metres from the main rear wall (in line with the proposed ground floor element), it would extend the full width of the original house.
6. As I observed on my site visit, the existing main rear wall to the host property, at first floor level, is flush with the main rear wall of 463 Redford Close (No.463). Both properties are also narrow. As a consequence, the nearest first floor window to No.463 is close to the boundary with the host property, where the proposed first floor element of the extension would be sited hard up against the boundary. In my judgement, this relationship would result in an unacceptable sense of enclosure and would be overbearing to the occupiers of No.463, particularly from their immediate first floor window and private amenity area.
7. The fact that the host property forms one end of a terrace of three properties does not impact on these findings. Similarly, the fact that there have been no objections from neighbouring properties does not infer that the appeal proposal is in some way acceptable or set aside the need for me to consider the impact of the proposal on the living conditions of existing as well as future occupiers of neighbouring properties. Reference has also been made to the fact that the main rear wall of No.462 steps back from that of No.463, setting a precedent for the appeal proposal. I do not agree. The relationship between No's 462 and 463 forms part of the original design of this terrace and wider estate.
8. I find therefore that the impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.463 would be unacceptable and that the proposal fails to comply with Policies CC2 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan (September 2015) (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.

Character and Appearance

9. Paragraph 3.2 of the (SPD) confirms that new extensions should seek to complement the original building, harmonise with adjoining properties and maintain the character of the streetscene. 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 HLP which, amongst other policies, the SDP specifically seeks to expand on and support.
10. Against this background, the proposed extension, specifically the first floor element, 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. It would extend the full width of the host property. As a consequence, it would overwhelm the original proportions of the

host property and detract from the built rhythm of the small terrace that it forms part of.

11. As I observed on my site visit, the appeal site forms part of an estate that comprises a number of similar terraces where, as part of their original design, some properties are slightly set back, others are flush with their neighbours and others step forward. The result is a simple but pleasing form and layout. As I also noted, the rear of the appeal site is highly visible from Redford Close. As a consequence, the proposed extension, specifically the first floor element, would appear out of keeping and overbearing, resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the area. That harm would be accentuated by the uncharacteristic elongated appearance of the main roof, as extended.
12. For the reasons given above, I find 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 and secure opportunities to enhance local character, promote high quality design and ensure that extensions are proportionate and subordinate to the original house.

Conclusions

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

G Roberts

INSPECTOR