



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: 11 FEBRUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/21/3282300
51 Grove Crescent, Feltham TW13 6NB

- 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 Ms Vanita Kanda against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00524/51/P13, dated 23 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as the retention of the first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter and Background

2. The first floor rear extension is already in place. I have therefore dealt with the appeal on the basis of the retention of the existing development.
3. The host property has a long planning history, which I have had regard to in my decision. That includes planning permission for the erection of a part single, part two storey side and rear extension (ref: 00524/51/P10) ('approved scheme'), which followed the refusal and dismissal at appeal of a previous scheme with the same description (Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/18/3216807) ('dismissed appeal').

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 adjacent occupiers, with particular regards to the outlook from 49 Grove Crescent.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The Council's Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2017 ('SPD') seeks to balance requirements for space against the need to prevent harm to neighbours' living conditions and harm to the character of the house and the area. Whilst it states that first floor rear extensions will be considered on their merits, it continues that they should be

- proportionate and subordinate to the main house, and that their width should be no greater than half the width of the original house.
6. The dwellings on Grove Crescent are typically arranged in short terraces or semi-detached pairs. Notwithstanding alterations and extensions, most retain a fairly simple form, particularly above ground floor level, although I observed a large dormer on the roof of No 53.
 7. The original house at No 51 has been greatly extended. That includes a two storey side extension, a large rear dormer, and a ground floor rear extension. Whilst the approved scheme included a first floor rear extension, the extension that has been built, and which is the subject of this appeal, is around 1.1m wider.
 8. At that width, the first floor extension projects across the property's rear face well beyond the side of the original house, and roughly half way across the rear face of the existing two storey side extension. This has resulted in an awkward and overly complex design which jars with the host, and with the prevailing much simpler form of nearby properties. Although the extension the subject of this appeal is less than half the width of the extended house, it is over half the width of the original house, thus contrary to the advice in the SPD.
 9. Unlike in the dismissed appeal, this scheme does not extend all the way to the boundary with 49 Grove Crescent ('No 49'). However, for the above reasons, I conclude similarly to that Inspector, that the combined mass and scale of this proposal, together with the other extensions, results in an overly dominant structure which harms the character and appearance of the host and the area.
 10. Given its elevated position, that harm is clearly visible from many nearby properties, as well as from the public highway through the gap between the dwellings at 41 and 43 Grove Crescent.
 11. Consequently, the scheme conflicts with those parts of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (2015) ('HLP') Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 which 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.

Living conditions

12. The rear face of No 49 is angled relative to No 51, such that the outlook from its door, windows and garden is partially constrained by the building on the appeal site. The side face of the extension before me is closer to the side boundary with No 49 than in the approved scheme.
13. Nevertheless, according to the Council's figures, its side face is still around 0.92m from that boundary, and its light rendered finish to match the materials on some other parts of the host, assists in limiting its perceived bulk, and also helps to reflect natural light.
14. Consequently, whilst in the dismissed appeal that Inspector found that the proposal would be visually obtrusive and would harmfully overbear on those adjacent occupiers, this scheme is sufficiently different so as to avoid such an impact.
15. The first floor extension is well over 2m from the original side wall of the non-adjointing property at No 49, as required by the SPD and, for the above

reasons, it has not impacted those occupiers' living conditions to a harmful degree. On this issue, the scheme does not therefore conflict with those parts of HLP Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 which 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

16. I have very few details of the allowed appeal cited by the appellant at 10 The Crofts (APP/B1550/D/19/3220909) which is, in any event, in a different local authority area.
17. I understand that the appellant's son has a disability. However, it is unclear how that is relevant to this proposal for a larger first floor extension compared to the approved scheme. Additionally, although the appellant states that the dimensions of the bedroom in the approved scheme fall below those required by the London Plan, the drawings in the approved scheme and in this appeal depict that the first floor extension is a study/office.
18. In its favour however, and in accordance with some policies in the development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework, the scheme makes an efficient use of the land to deliver more useable living space.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

19. Although the scheme has not caused significant harm to adjacent occupiers' living conditions, its limited benefits do not outweigh the significant harm that it has caused to the character and appearance of the host property and the area.
20. Whilst there are policies which provide limited support for the scheme, it conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole. Thus, having regard to all other matters raised, including representations by interested parties, the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR