



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 August 2022

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/22/3292385
78 Harvest Road, Feltham, TW13 7JG

- 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 Miss Amanda Lynn against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00572/78/P4, dated 3 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is Erection of a part single part double storey rear extension and a double storey side extension incorporating demolition of existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. In the interests of clarity, in the banner heading above I have referred to the description of the proposal given by the appellant on the appeal form as this gives a clear description of the type of development proposed which reflects that used by the Council in their decision notice.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2 storey semi-detached house with a single storey detached garage which is set back and to the side of the house and runs along the boundary with the neighbouring house, No 80. The appeal site is located on a bend in the road and the boundary with No 80 is at an angle. Consequently, the front of the appeal plot is narrower than the back, the side garage is at an angle to the house and the side of the house is visible from the road. Although houses in the street include small terraces, semi-detached and detached housing, they share common design features including hipped roofs, such as that on the appeal property.
5. The existing garage would be demolished to make way for the proposed extensions. The proposed 2 storey side extension would be set back slightly from the front wall of the house and set in from the boundary with No 80. Its side walls would be angled to reflect the plot shape such that it would be tapered at the front and wider towards the rear where it would connect to the

proposed ground floor rear extension. As a result, the proposed side extension roof would comprise 4 different sized pitched sections connected to a flat crown, rather than a hipped roof matching that of the main house. The angled flank walls and roof on the proposed extension would be visible from the road and pavement in front of the house and when approaching the bend in the road near No 80. From such views, it would appear as an unsympathetic addition at odds with the character and appearance of the host property and other houses in the area.

6. I appreciate that the design of the extension sought to work with the plot shape and width and reflects the angle of the existing garage. However, the garage is single storey and less obtrusive than the proposed development which would fail to harmonise with the host house and introduce a discordant element into the street scene and as such would be contrary to policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015-2030) (2015) which seek high quality attractive development that sensitively responds to the area's character, and to the guidance set out in the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2017) which advises that side extension walls should run parallel to the main house and their roofs should either be flat or reflect that of the host property.

Other Matters

7. I have had regard to examples provided by the appellant of other extensions on Harvest Road which did not fully accord with the advice in the SPD. However, neither were directly comparable to the proposed development in terms of its design and the harm that it would cause. In any case, I have come to my own view regarding the development rather than relying on the approach the Council may have taken elsewhere. The appellant also raised issues regarding communication with the Council during the application process. This is a matter between the Council and the appellant in the first instance.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR