

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2021

**by Les Greenwood MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 04 November 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3262761**

**1 East Road, Feltham TW14 8DG**

- 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 Balamurugan Vairakkannu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
  - The application Ref 00378/1/P2, dated 2 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 September 2020.
  - The development proposed is to retain the existing single storey rear extension to the existing dwelling.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and (retrospective) planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension to the existing dwelling in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 00378/1/P2, dated 2 April 2020, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the following approved plans: EA/AS/01/01 and EA/AS/01/02.
  - 2) The external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall be painted or otherwise coloured to match the colour of the main side wall of the house within 6 months of the date of this permission and shall thereafter be retained in a matching colour.

## Preliminary issues

2. The description of the proposed development set out on the application form, as recorded in the heading above, includes reference to retaining an existing extension. As 'retention' is not an act of development, I have omitted this from the formal decision at paragraph 1.
3. A new London Plan was adopted and a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework published after the submission of this appeal. I have taken these revised policies into account but do not consider that they significantly affect the consideration of these appeals.

## **Main issues**

4. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on:
  - i) the character and appearance of the house and the local area, including the setting of the Bedfont Green Conservation Area; and
  - ii) living conditions at the next door property 3 East Road in terms of the impact on outlook from that property.

## **Reasons**

### *Character and appearance*

5. 1 East Road is a 20<sup>th</sup> Century semi-detached house with rendered walls and a hipped roof. It has been extended twice to the rear. The more recent of these extensions is the subject of this appeal. The extension is in place so that I could see it at the time of my site visit.
6. The appeal extension is low in height and situated to the rear of the house away from the road. It can only just be glimpsed from the street, above fencing. It can furthermore only be seen clearly in a limited number of private views. It therefore has a very limited visual impact. Although the combined rear extension is deep in plan, its height, scale and position make it clearly subsidiary to the house. It sits comfortably within the house's very long garden so that the plot is not overdeveloped.
7. No 1 is notable for the variety of finishes used on the house, with cream coloured render on the front and side walls, a darker yellow on the first floor back wall, brick on the first rear extension and then white painted board on the appeal extension. This does not create a harmonious appearance. The colour of the extension is a matter that can be controlled by condition, to ensure it matches in with the main part of the house at least, helping to further minimise its visual impact.
8. Although 1 East Road adjoins the conservation area, the extension is not readily visible in significant views of the area. It has no material impact on the setting of that heritage asset.
9. I conclude that the proposal does not harm the character or appearance of the house or the local area and that it preserves the setting of the conservation area. It therefore accords with the aims of London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (HLP) Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 and the Council's 2017 Supplementary Planning Document *Residential Extension Guidelines* (REG), to secure high quality design that maintains the character of the area.

### *Living conditions*

10. The REG states that single storey rear extensions to semi-detached houses like this should not go back more than 3.65m, to avoid unacceptable enclosure to neighbours. In this case the combined depth of the extension would be about 8m, well beyond this guideline.
11. The main impact is on 3 East Road, the other half of the pair of houses, which has a much smaller rear extension. Although the appeal extension goes well beyond this, its impact on the outlook from the back of No 3 is limited by 2 significant factors. Firstly, the appeal extension is comparatively low, with a

nearly flat roof, so that it's height does not dominate views from No 3. Secondly, the houses in this street have very long rear gardens and No 5 to the other side has not been significantly extended, so that No 3 otherwise enjoys a wide, almost wholly unobstructed outlook.

12. I conclude that, despite some conflict with the specific guidance of the REG, the proposal does not unduly affect living conditions at No 3 in terms of outlook. It therefore accords with the aims of HLP Policy SC7 and the REG, to protect amenity and avoid unacceptable loss of outlook – taking account of the REG's aim ensure a balance between protecting neighbours' interests and meeting applicants' reasonable expectations for increased accommodation.

#### *Other matters*

13. I have also taken account of other comments made by objectors. In particular, new windows could not be added to the side elevations of this extension without the need for a further planning application. CCTV and lighting at the back of the extension could have been mounted on the back of the previous extension in any case without the need for planning permission. Any issues with overhanging guttering, drainage and the use of timber fall to be dealt with under other legislation and would not in themselves justify refusal. I note that the Council raises no objection in any of these respects.

#### *Conditions*

14. For retrospective proposals like this there is no need for the standard condition requiring a start within 3 years. I impose a condition specifying the proposed plans to provide certainty. A condition is also necessary, as above, to ensure a more harmonious use of colour on the extension's walls to protect local character and appearance.

#### **Conclusion**

15. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

*Les Greenwood*

INSPECTOR