



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2023

by J Davis, BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24TH August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/23/3319429

395 Bath Road, Hounslow, TW4 7RL

- 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 Vamshider Madhadi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00083/395/P1, dated 9 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is part two storey, part single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council's second refusal reason refers, amongst other matters, to the effect of the proposal on a conservation area. The Council has subsequently confirmed that this was in error as site is not within a conservation area. I have therefore dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area; and
 - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings, with particular reference to light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site comprises a two storey, mid-terrace dwelling located in a short row of similar dwellings, although the end property, 397 Old Bath Road, has been significantly altered to the front, side and rear. The appeal proposal is for a part single storey, part two storey rear extension.
5. Policies CC1 and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (2015) (LP) expect proposals (amongst other things) to respond to the context and character of the area in terms of design, whilst Policy SC7 requires residential alterations to complement the original building and harmonise with

adjoining properties. The Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (SPD) whilst non-statutory, provides useful design guidance. The SPD advises that first floor extensions should be proportionate and subordinate to the dimensions of the main house. It also states that the width of a first-floor rear extension should be no greater than half the width of the original house.

6. The width of the proposed two storey extension would exceed half the width of the original house, although it would be set in from both side boundaries and would have a slightly lower ridge height than the host dwelling. The width of the extension, in combination with its depth of about 3.6m would, in my view, fail to be a proportionate and subordinate addition to the dwelling. Instead, the extension would be an unsympathetic and incongruous addition which would dominate the rear elevation of the dwelling, to the detriment of its original character and appearance.
7. The appeal property backs onto a garage courtyard and the proposed extensions would not be prominent from any public vantage point although some views would be obtainable from neighbouring dwellings and the access to the rear. The proposed extensions would be viewed in the same context as the extensions to No 397 Old Bath Road. However, the proposed two storey extension would be deeper and wider than the rear extension to No 397 and would dominate the rear elevation of the terrace to an unacceptable degree. In this regard, the proposed two storey extension would be an incongruous feature which would be harmful to the wider character and appearance of the area.
8. Thus, I find that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. Accordingly, it would conflict with the design objectives of Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the LP, the SPD and the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

Living conditions

9. The SPD advises that two storey or first floor rear extensions will rarely be acceptable on a mid-terrace property. It also advises that the depth of a first floor extension should not normally project more than 2.5m beyond the rear wall of the house and that the first floor section should be set a minimum of 2m from the original side wall of a neighbouring dwelling to avoid loss of light or enclosure.
10. At first floor level, the proposed extension would have a depth of about 3.6m and would be set in 2m from the side boundary with 393 Old Bath Road and 1.1m from the boundary with No 397.
11. The appeal proposal does not comply with the above guidance in terms of its depth and its set back from the boundary with No 397. Notwithstanding this, there are other relevant considerations to take in account.
12. As No 397 has been significantly extended to the rear by a part two storey, part single storey extension, no ground floor windows would be adversely affected by the proposed development.
13. The closest first floor window to the appeal site is positioned closer to the original rear elevation of the dwelling than that the remainder of the extension. However, the proposed first floor extension would be set in 1.1m from the

boundary and would not infringe on a 45 degree line taken from the midpoint of this window. Having regard to these factors, I am satisfied that the proposed extension would not be overly dominant when viewed from windows on the rear of No 397 and accordingly, would not result in any significant overbearing effect that would be detrimental to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 397. Furthermore, as No 397 has itself been extended, the proposed extension would not have any significant overbearing effect when viewed from the rear garden of the dwelling.

14. For the same reasons and in the absence of any substantive evidence to the contrary, I also consider that the proposed extension would be unlikely have any serious effect on light received by the adjacent first floor window.
15. The proposed first floor extension would be set in 2m from the boundary with No 393 and given this distance, I am satisfied that the proposal would not be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of that dwelling through loss of light or outlook.
16. The proposed single rear extension would have a depth of about 4.5 metres and would extend across much of the full width of the host dwelling. It would be sited next to an existing extension to 397 Old Bath Road and adjacent to an outbuilding to the rear of No 393. I therefore concur with the Council that it would not result in any significant harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
17. I therefore conclude on this issue that despite some conflict with the SPD, the proposal would not have a significant harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings with particular reference to light and outlook. Thus, I find that it complies with the Framework and Policies CC2 and SC7 of the LP insofar as these policies seek a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Conclusion

18. I have found that the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring dwellings, however this does not outweigh the harm I have identified in terms of the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.
19. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR