



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2023

by A Caines BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/22/3309550

12 Craigwell Avenue, Hounslow, Feltham TW13 7JP

- 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 Dollar Shah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00310/12/P3, dated 27 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is front porch, single story side-rear extension (includes 6m rear extension as approved under prior approval) with associated internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on: i) the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area; and ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of 10 and 14 Craigwell Avenue, with particular regard to outlook and enclosure.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is one half of a pair of hipped roof, two-storey, semi-detached houses, which are set back from the road behind short front gardens with a driveway to the side and a detached garage towards the rear.
4. The proposed side and rear wrap-around extensions would be confined to the ground floor level and would be set in from the driveway boundary with No 10. Nonetheless, through their combined length and depth, these extensions would represent a disproportionately large addition relative to the plan form of the existing property. Moreover, due to their flat roof design, the extensions would have a crude box-like appearance, which would be markedly at odds with the design and proportions of the host building. The result would be a bulky and unsympathetic addition that would detract from the character and appearance of the host building, notwithstanding the use of matching materials.
5. The wrap-around extensions would not be highly discernible from the surrounding area, with public views being obtained primarily in the gap down the driveway. Nonetheless, limited public visibility does not remove the need to achieve good design and compliance with the relevant requirements of the development plan and associated guidance. The harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the host building is sufficient to find conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan (2015) (the LP) and the

supporting Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (SPD), which amongst other things, seek good design, and support the extension of residential properties where these do not result in harm to the existing building. Furthermore, paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that development that is not well designed should be refused.

6. The planning history of the site includes a 6 metre deep rear extension for which the Council confirmed prior approval was not required. Although it has yet to be constructed, I have no reason to doubt that it would be carried out in the event this appeal was dismissed, such that it should be regarded as a potential fallback position. However, as the fallback scheme does not wrap around to the side of the house, I consider that the visual effect would be less harmful than the appeal scheme. Accordingly, the weight that I attach to the fallback position in relation to this main issue is minimal.
7. I therefore conclude that the development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property, and thus conflicts with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the LP, as well as the SPD. It is also contrary to the Framework with regards to achieving well designed places.

Living conditions

8. The 6 metre projection from the rear wall of the house would be contrary to the SPD, which states that single-storey rear extensions on semi-detached houses should not exceed 3.65 metres in depth. However, it has been confirmed that an extension of the same depth could be constructed under the above-mentioned fallback position.
9. In any event, both No 10 and No 14 have their own rear extensions of over 3 metres in depth, which means that the degree of projection beyond their rear elevations would not be excessive. I also note that the projection beyond the rear of No 14 would be less than the existing garage which is to be removed, and it would be located further away from the boundary.
10. All these factors lead me to conclude that the development would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of 10 and 14 Craigwell Avenue, with particular regard to outlook and enclosure. Thus, despite some conflict with the SPD, the proposal complies with LP Policies CC2 and SC7 in so far as they seek to protect the living conditions of neighbours. However, this absence of harm is neutral and does not outweigh the harm I have identified in relation to the first main issue.

Conclusion

11. The proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building, and is therefore in conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. Material considerations, including the potential fallback position, do not indicate that the decision should be taken other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR