



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 December 2021

by Andrew Dale BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 January 2022

Appeal Ref. APP/F5540/D/21/3282052

11 Beaulieu Close, Hounslow TW4 5EN

- 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 A Kumar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application ref. 01620/11/P6, dated 25 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as "*Single Storey Rear Extension*". The Council's decision notice describes the proposal as "*Erection of a single storey front extension to the house.*"
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Matters of clarification

2. No. 11 forms part of a 2-storey terraced block of 6 compact back-to-back properties (9-14 Beaulieu Close). It shares a rear wall with no. 12. Like the other dwellings in the same block, it effectively has a single aspect. The principal adjoining elevations of nos 9, 10 and 11 face south-west towards the approach along Beaulieu Close from Frampton Road. The proposed extension would be added to that principal elevation. Those south-western elevations contain the main entrances to the properties under distinctive porches and are clearly perceived as the front elevations. At no.11, the single-storey side extension, the enclosure of its outdoor space to the south-west with tall fencing, the presence of sheds in that space and its designated car parking space in the parking court on the north-eastern side of the block, reached via a narrow gated path and door at the back of no. 11, do not alter that perception. The metal gate, set within the fencing adjacent to the footpath link between Beaulieu Close and Drayton Close, contains the postbox and provides the public access to the entrance porch. All these factors suggest to me that the Council's description of the proposal as a single-storey front extension is to be preferred.
 3. The Council, correctly in my view, did not identify an excessive loss of amenity for the neighbours at 53 Drayton Close. Rather, the stated concern in this regard in the officer's report related to the neighbours at "...12 Beaulieu Close...". However, from my reading of that report, I agree with the appellant that the Council meant instead to refer to 10 Beaulieu Close, the adjoining
-

terraced house to the south-east of the appeal property. I have assessed the second main issue in this appeal on that basis.

Main issues

4. The main issues are the effects of the proposed extension upon the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings and upon the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at 10 Beaulieu Close with regard to the potential for any overbearing effects on outlook and any loss of light.

Reasons

5. I acknowledge that the site and the surroundings do not fall within an area that possesses any heritage value but the front elevations of nos 9, 10 and 11 are very prominent in views along Beaulieu Close when approaching from Frampton Road. Despite the use of matching materials and a general architectural style which would reflect the existing single-storey side extension, the mass and bulk of the proposed single-storey front extension would make it an obvious element that would stand out well above the boundary treatments around the garden and well forward of the main building line set by these 3 properties, whether viewing at the front or across the building's side profile.
6. The proposed extension would cover the full width of the property's original front elevation and project out 3.65 m across that whole width. It would extend out further than the existing attached wooden storage shed and reach a greater height. That shed is an unfortunate appendage to the front of the property, but even if it is judged to be a lawful structure it only reaches slightly above the adjacent boundary fence and has a limited visual impact in the immediate surroundings. On the other hand, the development proposal would introduce a more permanent, prominent and substantial built form which would have an overly dominant impact on the property itself and would be uncharacteristic of the host terrace and the fairly uniform estate design hereabouts. It would have a far greater disruptive visual effect upon the host property and this local street scene compared to the existing porch and shed.
7. I consider that the proposed development would not represent a visually attractive solution that would add to the overall quality of the area. The development would not be sufficiently subservient or complementary to the original or existing building and would detract from the area's local character and the street scene. That the proposal disregards the design guidance in the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (SPD) confirms my findings on this issue in the particular circumstances of this case. The SPD explains that due to their prominent location, extensions to the front of the house must be minor and not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street. Normally, planning permission will only be given for small front entrance porches. Furthermore, front extensions that are larger than a porch, as is clearly the case here, will normally be refused because they stand out as unusual, bulky extensions that significantly change the appearance of the house and street.
8. I find on the **first main issue** that the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings. As the development would not be an example of high-quality design and would neither safeguard and enhance the qualities and character of this built environment nor

involve the acceptable extension and alteration of a residential property given how far the scheme would depart from the Council's relevant design guidance, there would be conflict with the aims of Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (LP). There would not be compliance with the key design themes in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) insofar as they relate to achieving well-designed places.

9. The occupiers of 10 Beaulieu Close did not respond to the neighbour consultation exercise conducted by the Council at the time of the application. However, given the proximity of the ground floor front windows at no. 10 to the boundary fencing and the additional depth and height of the proposed extension along and above that fencing, compared to the existing structures which are to be removed, I consider that the neighbours there would inevitably experience some overbearing effects and some diminution of outlook from inside the rooms served by those windows. Whilst the passage of sunlight to the front of no. 10 would not be obstructed, the natural daylighting conditions in those rooms would be made worse. Viewing these factors in the round and taking into account the fact that no. 10 is a single aspect dwelling, the scheme would have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of those neighbours.
10. I find on the **second main issue** that the proposed extension would harm the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at 10 Beaulieu Close with regard to overbearing effects on outlook and loss of light. This places the proposal in conflict with LP Policies CC2 and SC7 which, amongst other things, require development proposals to avoid harming the amenity of neighbouring residents. This aim is consistent with the Framework and the intent of the SPD.
11. My findings on the main issues are decisive to the outcome of this appeal. There is conflict with the development plan. The harm cannot be mitigated by the imposition of planning conditions and it is not outweighed by other material considerations, including the small size of the original dwelling and the improvements the scheme would bring about to the extent and layout of the internal habitable floor space.
12. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised and the absence of objections from local residents, I conclude that this appeal should not succeed.

Andrew Dale

INSPECTOR