
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 November 2022

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/22/3306212
356 Great West Road, Hounslow TW5 0BA

- 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 Mahammud Ramzan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00505/356/P4, dated 12 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear conservatory extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development firstly, on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area; and secondly, on the living conditions of the occupiers of 354 Great West Road with particular regard to sense of enclosure and light.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mainly 2-storey semi-detached house that stands within a row of dwellings on one side of Great West Road. In the vicinity of the site, properties are broadly similar in age, with some variety in their scale, design and general appearance. Consequently, the existing built form varies within the local area to which No 356 belongs.
4. The new conservatory would attach to the back wall of the existing flat roof rear extension and project outwards by 3-metres. The combined length of the existing extension and the new conservatory from the original back wall of No 356 would be almost double the limit of 3.65 metres for additions of this type that is advised in the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (REG). Like the rear extension to which it would attach, the proposal would also extend across the entire width of the main house.
5. In that context, the appeal scheme could not reasonably be described as a subordinate addition, which is expected of development proposals under Policy SC7 of the Council's Local Plan 2015-2030 (LP). The overall scale and depth of the existing and proposed rear extensions would cause them to visually dominate the back of the main house. There would also be an awkward juxtaposition of rooflines between the existing and proposed extensions given their sharply contrasting eaves levels and roof forms. As a result, the intrinsic

character of the host building would be spoilt with the new built form in place even with the use of matching external materials.

6. The new conservatory would not be readily visible from public vantage points given its position at the back of No 356, away from the road. Nevertheless, the appeal scheme would be evident from the rear gardens of the adjacent properties. From these vantage points, the proposal would draw the eye as an unsympathetic extension that would be out of keeping with the visual character of the host building and the local area.
7. I observed that some properties in the same row as No 356 have relatively large rear extensions, to which the appellant has referred and provided aerial photographs. These examples have blended into the local area and respected their host building with varying degrees of success. These cases serve to illustrate that such changes can have a significant impact on the character and appearance of the building and the area to which they belong. None of the examples that I saw involved a conservatory linked to a flat roof rear addition, as proposed. In any event, I have assessed the proposal on its own merits.
8. On the first main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. As such, the proposal conflicts with LP Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 and the guidance within the REG. These policies and guidance aim to ensure that development complements the original building and maintains the character of the local area.

Living conditions

9. The side elevation of the new conservatory would be up to and parallel with the shared rear boundary with the attached property, which is 354 Great West Road. The new side wall would partly enclose the back garden of No 354 and project above the boundary fence and so the upper part of the proposal would be evident from both here and through the rear windows.
10. From what I saw, No 354 has been extended at the rear with its main back wall broadly aligning with that of the appeal dwelling. Consequently, when seen from the rear of this neighbouring property, the proposal would appear modest in depth. The main direction of outlook from the rear-facing windows of No 354 across its long rear garden would not be significantly affected. Furthermore, because the rears of No 354 and 356 face northwest, the loss of natural light due to the proposal would be modest in both duration and extent.
11. In summary, the new conservatory would be close to the rear of No 354. However, neither its height nor depth would cause the appeal scheme to unduly heighten a sense of enclosure nor result in an appreciable loss of light. Hence, the living conditions of the occupiers of No 354 would not be materially reduced. Accordingly, the proposal does not conflict with LP Policies CC1, CC2 or SC7 or the REG insofar as they aim to safeguard residential amenity.
12. For the same reason, the new development accords with the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that development should ensure a high standard of amenity for all users. My favourable finding on this second issue does not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified in relation to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area.

Other matters

13. The appellant and his family have experienced several break-ins at the appeal dwelling. I note that the Police has advised that providing a further barrier to restrict access into the property could potentially deter future incidents. I have considerable sympathy for these personal circumstances, which can be unsettling. However, there is nothing before me to indicate that the only way to improve the security of the property and enhance the safety of the appellant and his family is to erect a conservatory, as proposed.
14. Reference is made to a recent appeal decision¹ at 358 Great West Road, which granted prior approval for a single storey rear extension. Since the procedure followed in that case differs with the proposal before me, the assessment was confined to a single issue: the living conditions of the occupiers of adjoining premises. It is not directly comparable with the development sought here and so I attach only very limited weight to the decision at No 358 in support of the appellant's case.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR

¹ Ref APP/F5540/D/19/3243279 dated 20 March 2020