



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2022

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19TH January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/21/3282423

65 Winchester Road, Feltham TW13 5JX

- 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 Farzaneh Rasouli against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01214/65/P2, dated 7 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is ground floor rear and side extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for ground floor rear and side extensions at 65 Winchester Road, Feltham TW13 5JX in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 01214/65/P2, dated 7 July 2021, and the submitted location plan and drawing numbers GTD590A-01, GTD590A-02, and GTD590A-03.

Procedural Matters

2. Both ground floor extensions are already in place. I have therefore dealt with this appeal on the basis of the retention of the existing development as depicted on the submitted drawings.
3. Representations were made by interested parties regarding the replacement of an upstairs rear bedroom window with patio doors. However, whilst I observed those doors on my visit, they are not depicted on the drawings and form no part of this scheme.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The host comprises one half of a two storey semi-detached pair, which has a long, single storey, flat-roofed rear projection. That rear projection is in turn attached to a gabled structure, which abuts the boundary with 63 Winchester Road ('No 63').

6. Amongst other things, the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2017 ('SPD') sets out that whilst proposals will be considered on their merits, they should appear secondary to the original house, and should reflect its design and character. In order to achieve that, and to protect neighbours' living conditions, it states that rear extensions should not extend more than 3.65m from the original rear wall. It adds that second extensions added to existing extensions can raise design issues and will normally be refused.
7. The rear extension the subject of this appeal is attached to the host's flat-roofed rear projection. According to the Council's calculations, the end of the extension lies 8.5m beyond the host's original rear wall – thus well in excess of the guidelines in the SPG. However, the rear extension projects no deeper than the existing gabled structure and, in effect, fills in the gap between it and the boundary with 67 Winchester Road ('No 67'). Additionally, its very shallow pitched roof broadly respects the height and form of the roof on the rear projection; and it is not visible in the streetscene.
8. The side extension is attached to the front face of the gabled structure, but is set well back from the host's principal front elevation. It is a modestly proportioned building with a low height. As a result of that, and its rearward siting behind a tall front gate, it can only be glimpsed in the streetscene, where it does not draw the eye.
9. Given its varied roof forms and heights, the host property, as extended, does have a somewhat eclectic appearance. However, the roofs in the extensions the subject of this appeal broadly respect the roof form of some other parts of the building. Although in some places they adjoin roofs of a different height or form, those junctions are not prominent. Additionally, the red masonry on the scheme's walls broadly respects the finish of the host building.
10. For the above reasons, whilst I have had regard to cumulative impacts, given the limited height and size of the extensions in this appeal, and that they essentially fill in gaps in the building's pre-existing footprint, without extending it further in any direction, the extensions do not appear incongruous, and they are suitably subordinate to the host.
11. Consequently, although the scheme does not fully accord with the SPD, I am satisfied that it has not harmed the character and appearance of the host property or the area. It does not therefore conflict with those parts of Policies CC1 and CC2 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (2015) ('HLP') which set out that proposals should respond sensitively to the site and its context, having regard to matters such as the massing and height of surrounding buildings.
12. It also accords with the approach in HLP Policy SC7, including its stance that residential extensions should have regard to the quality, character, materials and scale of the principal building, and be subordinate to it. Given my findings regarding the scheme's design, dismissal of the appeal would not find support from paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('Framework').

Living conditions

13. The Council calculates that the rear extension projects about 2.1m beyond the conservatory at No 67; and its side wall is adjacent to the plot boundary. However, it has a limited single storey height, and the neighbouring

conservatory has an outlook to the rear and to one side. Consequently, whilst the extension can be clearly seen to one side from the conservatory, the principal outlook from there, and from the adjacent garden, down No 67's own outdoor amenity areas has not been significantly affected. The scheme has not given rise to a harmful overbearing impact.

14. Given the limited size and low height of the side extension, it has not harmfully impacted the outlook from No 63, whose side face is set in from the common boundary.
15. Consequently, although the scheme's depth does not accord with the numeric guidance in the SPD, it has not impacted those occupants' living conditions to a harmful degree. On this issue it does not therefore conflict with those parts of HLP Policies CC2 and SC7 which seek to minimise harm to neighbouring residents, and which set out that proposals should provide an adequate outlook and minimise overbearingness. Nor does it conflict with the requirement at Framework paragraph 130 to ensure a high standard of amenity.

Other matters

16. Although it is alleged that noisy building works took place throughout the week, as the development is already in place, that is beyond my control. I have no persuasive evidence that the development has adversely affected sewers, or that the scheme has not been appropriately designed having regard to fire safety.

Conclusion

17. I have found that the scheme does not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area, and that it does not impact neighbouring occupiers' living conditions to a harmful degree. Notwithstanding the conflict with the numeric guidance in the SPD, the scheme accords with the development plan when considered as a whole, and the appeal will be allowed.
18. Turning to the matter of conditions, the Council has suggested a single condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the submitted drawings. However, as it is already in place, that is unnecessary. For the above reasons, having regard to all other matters raised, including representations by interested parties, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR