



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 September 2022

by Sian Griffiths BSc(Hons) DipTP MScRealEst MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/22/3300985

38 Bear Road, Feltham, TW13 6RA

- 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 Andrew Abuza against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref P/2022/0473, dated 11 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 11 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a single storey rear extension at 38 Bear Road, Feltham in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2022/0473, dated 11 February 2022 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
A405EC2B8F0D11EC84EC00059A3C7A00;
A405EC318F0D11EC84EC00059A3C7A00;
A405EC298F0D11EC84EC00059A3C7A00;
A405EC358F0D11EC84EC00059A3C7A00;
F13738A692FB11ECBF9600059A3C7A00.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have been made aware that the case officers report makes reference to a different proposal than the one set out in the original planning application form, which contains the following description of development: '*replica roof extension to the rear of the property*'. This was an error which is accepted by the appellant's agent in their appeal statement.
3. I have therefore proceeded to determine this appeal in accordance with the description of development shown on the decision notice as it is clear to me that this most accurately reflects what is being proposed.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:

- The effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area
- The effect of the proposals on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. Bear Road is a predominantly residential street of a suburban character. The appeal property at No38 is a semi-detached, two storey, post-war house with parking to the front within a small garden and shared pedestrian side access to a good-sized rear garden.
6. I could see at the site visit that a number of neighbouring properties had been subject to rear extensions, including the adjacent property No36 which had a substantial single storey rear extension with a mono pitch roof flanked by brick parapet walls. No38 is separated from its semi-detached neighbour at No40 by a high close-boarded fence.
7. Policy CC1 (Context and Character) of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015) (LP) seeks to achieve good development that responds well to local character.
8. Policy CC2 (Urban Design and Architecture) of the LP similarly seeks to raise design standards and ensure proposals are responsive to their context whilst not undermining the living conditions of existing and future occupiers.
9. Policy SC7 (Residential Extensions and Alterations) of the LP has an objective of ensuring that proposals maintain the character of an area, do not result in harm to the amenity of neighbouring or future occupiers, nor the existing built and natural environments.
10. The Hounslow Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (SPD) sets out guidance for householders considering extensions to their properties, identifying how character and appearance can be protected and how it should harmonise with its surroundings through the use of similar materials, scale and design.
11. The proposed single storey rear extension would be significant at 4.7m in terms of its depth but having regard to the pattern of built form associated with neighbouring properties and the extensions which already serve some of these neighbouring properties, I consider the proposed extension in this instance would overall remain subordinate to the host dwelling. I therefore do not consider this would amount to harm to character and appearance that would be contrary to policies CC1, CC2 and SC7, nor the relevant parts of the SPD.

Living Conditions

12. In turning to the impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, I was able to see the proximity of the extension to the windows of No40 in particular.
13. At section 4.3, the SPD states that semi-detached dwellings would be expected to have a maximum depth limit on single storey extensions of 3.65m. The appeal proposal would exceed this by just over 1m. It is clear however that the SPD guidance is dependent on the host dwelling, the size of garden, the

proximity of neighbours and the position of the proposed extension relative to those neighbours.

14. The proposed extension would result in greater enclosure to the neighbouring garden of No40, but not to the degree where I would consider it harmful to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers. Given that the extension will be north of the immediate adjacent neighbour at No40, I do not consider there would be any impact on daylight and sunlight to the occupiers.
15. To that end, I therefore do not consider there to be harm associated with the appeal proposals that would offend policies CC1, CC2 or SC7, nor the relevant parts of the SPD.

Conditions

16. I have applied conditions 1 and 2 as suggested by the council, in the interests of precision and to define the plans with which the scheme should accord.

Conclusions

17. For the reasons given, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions set out above.

Sian Griffiths

INSPECTOR