



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 April 2021

by Rebecca Thomas MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3266085

49 Thorncliffe Road, Southall UB2 5RL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Schedule 2, Part 1, Paragraph A.4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr S Khaneja against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
The application Ref 01120/49/PA3, dated 29 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is Ground floor rear extension 6 metres deep, maximum height of 3metres, 3 metres high to the eaves
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council altered the description of the development from *"single storey rear extension"* to *"Ground floor rear extension 6 metres deep, maximum height of 3metres, 3 metres high to the eaves."* I consider this to be a more accurate description of the appeal proposals and I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.
3. The provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, Paragraph A.4 (7) require the local planning authority to assess the proposed development solely on the basis of its impact on the amenity of the adjoining premises, taking into account any representations received. Whilst the neighbour responses have made representations additional to amenity, my determination of this appeal has been made solely on the basis of amenity as required.

Main Issue

4. I consider the main issue in this appeal to be the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of the occupiers of adjoining premises with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling located on a corner plot. The property is attached to no.51 Thorncliffe Road, which has a single storey rear

extension with a mono-pitched roof. This extension extends 3.3m and its wall forms part of the boundary with the appeal site. The boundary between the two gardens consists of a short run of brick wall with low trellis on top, and then the remainder is a standard close-board fence. I was also able to see at the time of my site visit that no. 53, the other neighbouring property to no. 51 had also been extended with extensions which protrude beyond the rear wall of the extension at no. 51.

6. The proposed development would be three metres high with a flat roof, with part of the roof on the boundary with no. 51 being sloped away from that boundary. The extension would extend to 6 metres along the boundary with no. 51, with the change in roof design being at a point of approximately 3.15 metres from the rear elevation.
7. Notwithstanding the partially sloped roof to the extension, the full extent of the development to 6m along the shared boundary would extend for some distance beyond the rear of the extension at no. 51. The development would create a dominant and solid flanking wall and would thus create an unneighbourly sense of enclosure. Whilst part of the roof would slope away from no. 51, I do not consider that this overcomes the harm identified that would be caused as a result of the additional development in proximity to that neighbour.
8. Local Plan¹ Policy SC7 (Residential Extensions and Alterations) expects extensions to residential dwellings to (amongst other things) minimise harm to neighbouring residents. Policy CC2 (Urban Design and Architecture) of the Local Plan expects development to have a positive impact on the amenity of current and future residents. The Council's adopted Residential Extension Guidelines² states that single storey rear extensions should not project too far from the rear wall of the original house, and sets out maximum depths, being 3.65m for a semi-detached house. I consider that the proposal would conflict with the Local Plan policies and the Residential Extension Guidelines and there would also be conflict with national planning policy which seeks to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjacent properties.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Rebecca Thomas

INSPECTOR

¹ London Borough of Hounslow – Local Plan 2015-2030 (September 2015)

² London Borough of Hounslow – Residential Extension Guidelines (Supplementary Planning Document) (December 2017)