



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2022

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18TH January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/21/3279818

2 Ryland Close, Feltham TW13 4QH

- 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 D Collison against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01502/2/P1, dated 17 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as the retention of a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 2 Ryland Close, Feltham TW13 4QH in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 01502/2/P1, dated 17 April 2021, and the submitted drawings dated 17 March 2021.

Procedural Matter

2. The extension is already in place. I have therefore dealt with this appeal as the retention of the existing development.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - The character and appearance of the host property and the area;
 - Adjacent occupiers' living conditions.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The Council's Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2017 ('SPD') sets out that, whilst proposals will be considered on their merits, so as to ensure that they appear secondary to the original house, and so as to protect neighbours' living conditions, single storey rear extensions should not extend more than 3.05m from the original rear wall of a terraced house.
5. With regards materials, it states that the aim is to integrate extensions with the original house keeping the range of materials used to a minimum. It continues that whilst matching materials are usually required, contemporary solutions may be acceptable, but that they should respect the context.

6. At around 4m deep, this extension exceeds the numeric guidance in the SPD. Its light-coloured, rendered finish contrasts with the red masonry on the host and on the remainder of this terrace.
7. However, that finish assists in giving the extension a modern, lightweight appearance; and its scale and mass are limited by its low, flat-roofed single storey form. Although the render contrasts with the brickwork, it responds to the colour of the window frames and eaves details on the host and most other properties in the terrace.
8. There are no similar extensions on this part of Ryland Close, but given my findings above, this one has not harmed the character and appearance of the area, and its rearward location is such that it is not visible in the Ryland Close streetscene. For the above reasons it also responds appropriately to the design of the host, and appears suitably subordinate to it.
9. Amongst other things, Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 ('HLP') Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 require development to respond sensitively to the site and its context, and to complement the original building, having regard to the advice in the SPD. For the above reasons, notwithstanding that the scheme's depth does not comply with the SPD's numeric advice, it does not conflict with its general stance, nor with the above policies.

Living conditions

10. Neither adjoining property has a rear extension, although No 3, which is set slightly closer to the road than No 2, has an enclosed and covered area immediately to the rear. As a result of this scheme, the outlook from its ground floor rear openings, the covered area and the adjacent garden has become more enclosed.
11. However, given the extension's flat-roofed form and its limited single storey height, and that it is set in from the boundary fence and protrudes only a limited amount above it, the scheme has not resulted in a significant overbearing impact on those occupiers. Additionally, its light-coloured finish limits its perceived bulk. As its openings are to the rear, the outlook from them is principally down the host's own garden.
12. These findings also hold true for the impact on No 1. At ground floor its closest opening to the scheme comprises a glazed door. Its rear window is further from the boundary, and the outlook from there is principally down that property's relatively wide garden, and is not significantly impacted by this scheme, which is off-set well to the side.
13. Having regard to the scheme's context, its limited height and its proportions, and the sun's trajectory, I am not persuaded that the development has caused a significant overshadowing impact on the occupants of No 1, or a significant loss of light.
14. Consequently, whilst the scheme exceeds the maximum depth advised by the SPD, it has not impacted adjacent occupiers' living conditions to a harmful degree. It does not therefore conflict with those parts of HLP Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 which, in broad terms, require development to minimise harm to neighbouring residents, provide an adequate outlook and sufficient sunlight and daylight, minimise overbearing impacts, and to have regard to the SPD.

Other matters

15. Whilst it is alleged that noisy and disruptive building works were carried out during lockdown at unsociable hours, given that the development is already in place, that is beyond my control.
16. Although the number of occupants in No 2 is likely to increase as a result of this scheme, reasonable domestic use would not cause significant noise or disturbance to adjacent occupiers; and the Council has confirmed that its use as a small House in Multiple Occupation does not require planning permission.
17. I have no cogent evidence to support the assertion that the property operates as a refuge or a rehabilitation centre. Despite two recent incidents, I am not persuaded that this extension directly results in significantly increased criminality, which in any event would be a police matter.

Conclusion

18. Summing up, having considered the scheme on its merits, I am satisfied that it does not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area, or impact the adjacent occupiers' living conditions to a harmful degree. It does not conflict with the development plan.
19. Although the Council has suggested the standard time limit condition and a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings, as it is already in place, they are unnecessary. The suggested matching materials condition is not relevant to the development proposed.
20. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, including representations by interested parties, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR