



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2023

by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/22/3303165

79 Bath Road, Hounslow TW3 3BN

- 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 C Parmar against the decision of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00083/79/P10, dated 17 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposed part single storey side and rear extension.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. There are two main issues. These are the effect of the proposed development on a) the living conditions of the occupiers of No 77 Bath Road; and b) the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living Conditions

3. The crux of the Council's concerns in regard to this main issue is the effect of the appeal scheme on the outlook from and light into side windows of No 77 Bath Road due to its proximity, length and height. The extension would be of significant length and stood off the shared boundary with No 77 by a marginal amount. Just inside the existing brick boundary wall.
4. Whilst the extension would present the same mass of brickwork to the shared boundary the same distance away from the side windows of No 77 alleged to be affected, it would be discernible as a more solid structure of greater massing and, when taking into account its roof, of greater height. These matters, taken together, would give rise to something of a looming presence for occupiers of the affected rooms in No 77. Owing to the siting of No 79 relative to No 77 and the use of a slight slope to the roof, I do not agree that the extension would unacceptably affect the amount of light experienced in the affected rooms. However, the extension would, by virtue of the above factors, reduce the quality of the outlook therefrom to the detriment of the living conditions of the building's occupiers.
5. The appeal scheme would therefore conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan: Volume One (2015-2030) (Local Plan) and the guidance set out by the Residential Extension Guidelines

Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (SPD) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework). Together, amongst other things and in regard to this main issue, these policies and guidance seek to ensure that new development is contextually appropriate, provides adequate outlook and minimises harm to neighbouring residents.

Character and Appearance

6. The appeal building is a detached hipped roof bungalow set back from and facing the road. It is somewhat anomalous as a single storey building, situated on the corner of Clipstone Road. As a result the rear of the building is highly visible in the public realm. Scale, design and siting along Bath Road varies. There is however a pleasant consistency to the type and style of buildings to the north of the appeal site as part of the residential estate formed by Bulstrode Road and Avenue.
7. The proposed extension, whilst to something of a uniquely designed building for the area, would utilise a substantial amount of flat roof. The feature is used elsewhere on the building but in a proportionately small area. The extent of flat roof, when considered with the size of the extension itself, would represent a substantial and visually unrelated addition to the building. It would jar awkwardly with the prevailing roof form of the bungalow, to the detriment of its overall design and appearance. The prominence of the building on the aforementioned street corner would exacerbate its harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area.
8. As such, the proposed development would conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Local Plan and the guidance set out by the SPD and the Framework. Together, amongst other things and in regard to this main issue, these policies and guidance seek to ensure that new development responds to local architectural vernacular, conserves and takes opportunities to enhance features, support high quality urban design, complement the original building and harmonise with adjoining properties.

Other Matter

9. The appellant sets out that the appeal scheme is to provide accommodation for an extended family. There is no further detail precisely on what specific needs there might be nor indeed why any need could not be met elsewhere. I can only therefore attach limited weight to this matter.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan. I ascribe this significant weight. There are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR