



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 April 2021

by Rebecca Thomas MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3259350

12 Vicarage Farm Road, Hounslow TW3 4NW

- 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 Ravi Gupta against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01151/12/P3, dated 22 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is Part Single & Part First Floor Rear Extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Part Single & Part First Floor Rear Extension to the house at 12 Vicarage Farm Road, Hounslow TW3 4NW in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 01151/12/P3, dated 22 May 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL/A500/01 (Existing Ground and First Floor Plans); PL/A500/02 (Existing elevations); PL/A500/03 (Proposed Ground and First Floor Plans); PL/A500/04 (Proposed Elevations); PL/A500/05 (Location and Site Plan).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed, but a different wording has been entered (which matches the Council's decision notice). Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

3. From the evidence I have before me, I consider the main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Vicarage Farm Road is a wide residential street where dwellings are set back from the road, with parking or garden areas located to the frontages. The appeal property is a red brick semi-detached dwelling, with red tile roof, a central chimney feature with a driveway and garden area to the front. There is access to the rear of the property via a side gate, which is mirrored by the neighbouring property at no. 10 Vicarage Farm Road. The boundaries with the neighbouring properties are low fences, creating an open character to these gardens. I was able to see at my site visit that there were some alterations to other nearby houses, of varying types.
5. The appeal dwelling has a small two storey outrigger projection across part of the rear elevation. The proposed development would introduce a two storey element to the existing outrigger element of the house, with a hipped gable roof with its apex set below the ridge of the roof of the existing dwelling.
6. No. 14 appears to have been altered with a single storey mono-pitch roofed rear extension. This is across the full width of no. 14. The proposed development would also stretch across the width of no. 12, replicating the depth of the existing extension at no. 14, and would not project beyond that extension. The single storey element of the appeal proposal would provide a flat roofed extension with a lantern over. The materials are proposed to be of similar appearance to that of the existing.
7. The Council raises concern with regard to windows, namely that the overhang of the eaves to the existing first floor window (shown on the plan to serve bedroom 01) would disfigure the appearance of the house and that the first floor window would be disproportionate to the existing. I acknowledge that the elevation plans appear to show a slight overhang from the eaves, however the first floor plan as proposed appears to me to show that the eaves in fact meet the side element of that window, and so the impact to this window is likely to be very limited. Whilst I am able to see that the proposed first floor window (to serve bedroom 03) may be of a smaller height to those on the existing dwelling, I note that this proposed window would be the same height as those on the existing at first floor (serving the bathroom and hall) and to this outrigger element of the dwelling. In addition, the Council raises concern that the proposed roof lantern would be non-subservient and would be inappropriate to the setting. Whilst this is a different approach to the neighbouring extension, I do not consider that it would inherently cause harm to the character or appearance of the local area nor the host dwelling.
8. The proposed development would appear to me to reflect the characteristics of the existing property and I consider that the scale, form, appearance and layout would not cause harm to the host property. In addition to this, the proposed development is located to the rear of the house and is not readily visible from the street. Given my conclusions above, and the location of the development, I do not consider that the development would cause harm to the character or appearance of the area.

9. The Council's SPD on residential extensions¹ sets out guidance, including on two storey and first floor rear extensions, expecting that heights and widths should be proportionate and subordinate to the dimensions of the main house without causing harm to the character of the host property or surrounding area. Given the use of similar materials, the scale and layout of the proposals, coupled with the location of the development to the rear of the property, lead me to conclude that the features (in particular the window design) is not significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
10. I therefore find no conflict with policies found within the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) nor the policies within the London Plan² or the policies in Local Plan³, in particular CC1, CC2 and SC7, all of which expect a high quality of design from development, including being of a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality.

Other Matters

11. I note from the appeal documentation that concern has been raised with regard to impacts to outlook and access to sunlight and daylight. I concur with the Council's conclusions that the single storey element, combined with the depth which would not protrude beyond the existing single storey element at no. 14, would ensure that there is no harmful effect to the occupiers of that dwelling from loss of daylight or sunlight. I consider that the distance from no. 10 would also prevent any harm to the occupiers of that property.
12. Other concerns raised relate to civil matters (foundations of adjacent buildings).

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard timescale for implementation condition, it is necessary to attach a condition confirming the approved drawings in the interests of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition to ensure that the external materials would match the existing.

Conclusion

14. I have found that there is no harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling nor to the local area. I therefore conclude that, subject to the above conditions, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be allowed.

Rebecca Thomas

INSPECTOR

¹ London Borough of Hounslow – Residential Extension Guidelines (Supplementary Planning Document) (December 2017)

² The London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for London (March 2021)

³ London Borough of Hounslow – Local Plan 2015-2030 (September 2015)