



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 December 2022

by K L Robbie BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/22/3298437

65 Clifford Road, Hounslow TW4 7LR

- 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 Raj Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00280/65/P17, dated 14 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is first floor part rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the:
 - character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property at 67 Clifford Road (No. 67) with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a large detached double fronted property located at the junction of Basildene Road and Clifford Road. It was originally built as a house and is currently in use as a doctor's surgery and self-contained flat.
4. The building has two-storey bay windows to both the front and side elevations and has been previously extended, including a substantial single storey flat roofed projection extending the entire length of what would have been the rear garden, on the boundary with No. 67. The result is a building with a complex roof structure including gabled, hipped, crowned and flat roofed elements. It is situated in an area which is predominantly made up of more modestly proportioned and detailed terraced and semi-detached residential properties, although there are several detached properties close by.
5. The proposed first floor extension would be situated on the rear of the two-storey element of the property and would substantially extend the building's flank elevation rearwards along Basildene Road. Although it would be set in from the boundary of No. 67, it would extend in line with the side elevation facing Basildene Road, resulting in an uncharacteristic undercroft element to the extension supported by a brick pillar. The proposal would

- provide three additional consulting rooms at first floor level for the doctor's practice.
6. Given the prominence of the appeal property on the junction and the nature of previous extensions together with the form of the original property, the proposal would appear bulky and incongruous when viewed from various vantage points along Basildene Road. Despite the inset from the boundary with No. 67 the extended building would be much larger in scale than the existing buildings in the surrounding area and would dominate the rear of the appeal property. Furthermore, the large undercroft feature would be out of character with the prevailing form of development along street.
 7. The appellant asserts that the existing property does not contribute positively to the street scene and the proposal would balance out the appearance of the property. However, the proposed extension would be harmful for the reasons I have set out above. It would not contribute positively to the streetscene or balance the appearance of the host building and, as such, I give the appellant's argument in this respect, little weight.
 8. For the reasons given, therefore, the proposal would cause harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would be in conflict with policies CC1 and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 Volume One (the Local Plan) which seek to ensure that proposals sensitively and creatively respond to an areas character and function and promote high quality design.

Living Conditions

9. The proposed extension would be inset from the boundary with No. 67 and would extend to just over 8m from the main rear elevation, 3.5m beyond the end of the existing rear projection. A gap between the appeal property and the side elevation of No. 67 and the orientation of the proposed extension to the east of this property would mean that the outlook and light to habitable rooms at the rear of No. 67 would not be unduly affected by the proposal.
10. Furthermore, the gap between the proposal and the flank wall of 80a Basildene Road would mean that there would not be an unacceptable sense of enclosure for the occupiers of No. 67. Nor would the proposal be unacceptably overbearing for occupiers of No. 67.
11. The appellant has utilised the 45° rule in an attempt to demonstrate that the proposal would not adversely impact the neighbouring properties in terms of outlook and sense of enclosure. However, I have no evidence before me that the Council adopts such an approach and, as I have already concluded there would be no harm in this respect, I give this little weight.
12. The proposal would therefore not harm the living conditions of occupiers of No. 67 with particular regard to outlook and light. There would therefore be no conflict with Local Plan policy CC2 which seeks to ensure that developments provide adequate outlook for the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

13. I acknowledge that the proposal would provide additional consulting rooms which would enable greater numbers of patients to be seen. I also recognise that patient numbers may increase due to the level of housebuilding in the

borough and another doctor's surgery nearby has closed. However, I do not find that that these matters outweigh the harm that I have found with regard to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

14. I have also had regard to a smaller extension, of a similar design which has been granted planning permission at the appeal property. The current appeal scheme is substantially larger than that proposal. Accordingly, it is not comparable with the appeal scheme and does not persuade me to reach an alternative conclusion on the appeal before me.

Conclusion

15. Although that I have found that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 67, I have found that it would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the appeal site and its surroundings. Therefore, having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

KL Robbie

INSPECTOR