



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2023

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/23/3328526

2 Parkfield Avenue, Feltham, TW13 7LF.

- 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 and Mrs Niochau against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00861/2/P3, dated 21 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 14 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey side and rear extension with porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue.

2. I consider that there are two main issues on this case:
 - a) the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host property and thereby the character and appearance of the street scene and the wider area; and,
 - b) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the adjoining occupiers in terms of its potential to result in a loss of outlook, privacy and daylight/sunlight.

Reasons

First main issue

3. The appeal property, 2 Parkfield Avenue is a semi-detached bungalow. It is located in an area characterised by a mix of similar semi-detached bungalows.
4. The appellants propose a single storey flat roofed wrap around rear/side extension. The rear extension would project about 6.0 metres beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling. The side addition would be built right up to the side boundary and extend from the rear of the dwelling as extended to the front of the existing building. A modest pitched roof addition is also proposed to bedroom 1 at the front of the dwelling.
5. By reason of the depth of the rear extension and the projection of the side addition right to the main façade the proposed extension would, by reason of its footprint alone visually subsume the host property. In addition, the

- proposed flat roofed extension proposed would overall appear as a large utilitarian and unattractive addition to this traditional pitched roofed bungalow.
6. Further, the design does not incorporate either any modulation or fenestration to what would be, when built a very long flank wall. Accordingly, this would be a bland and utilitarian façade that would appear visually intrusive and harmful to the appearance of the host property and the wider area.
 7. The fenestration pattern proposed for the rear elevation of the extension would, in my judgement appear very nondescript and uninteresting in appearance, thus adding to the overall poor visual appearance of the dwelling as extended.
 8. Due to the location and design of the small extension to the bedroom 1 it would unbalance and thereby detract from the street facing bay window which remains a key design feature of the original bungalow.
 9. For all these reasons I consider that the proposed extension would cause significant harm to the architectural integrity of the host property by failing to respect its existing design, character and proportions. It would thereby also result in harm the character and appearance of the street scene and the wider local area. This would be contrary to the aims of Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of The London Borough of Hounslow-*Local Plan 2015-2030* (Adopted 15 September 2015) (LP) as well as the intent of The London Borough of Hounslow - *Residential Extension Guidelines* (Adopted 20 December 2017) (SPD) as they relate to, amongst other things, the quality of design and the need for design to have regard to the urban context.

Second main issue:

10. The semi-detached property, number 4 currently projects about 3.5 metres beyond the rear wall of number 2. Accordingly, the proposed 6.0 metre deep rear extension to 2 would project only about 2.5 metres beyond the existing rear wall of number 4.
11. Consequently, given the limited rearward projection, I am not persuaded that the proposed rear addition would result in such a significant a loss of outlook, privacy or light as asserted by the Council as to cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of number 4 Parkside Avenue.
12. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would accord with the objectives of LP Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 as well as the SPD as they seek to, amongst other thing, protect residential living conditions.

Other Matters

13. I understand from the evidence before me that, following a prior approval application and a subsequent certificate of lawfulness application the Council has previously found, in the context of those overall scheme designs, that certain elements of what now forms part of the appeal scheme would have not required prior approval (local planning authority reference PA/2023/0147) or were permitted development (local planning authority reference 00861/2/LAW1). In particular a 6.0 metre deep full width rear extension, a side extension the depth of the original dwelling and a replacement porch, similar to the extension to bedroom 1 now proposed.

14. Those previous approved proposals may well, as be suggested by the appellant represent a fall-back position, such that they have a lawful ability to undertake the fall-back development. Nevertheless, each of the three elements, that are now part of the appeal scheme, were each slightly different in design and part of very different overall design proposals. While I have had due regard to the earlier approvals, I have determined this appeal based on the overall design proposal before me and its individual planning merits. Accordingly, I have given the earlier approvals limited weight in my determination of this appeal.
15. Further, I note the appellants concern that if they were to utilise the fall back the shorter length side extension by not linking up with the rear addition would result in an unattractive gap between the side and rear extensions. In addition, this gap would attract, amongst other things, fly tipping. In my judgement the setback referred to would have the merit of breaking up what would otherwise be a long blank façade and therefore would be more attractive than what is proposed. In terms of fly tipping etc. I have no reason to believe that this small area, albeit adjacent to the boundary, would attract such anti-social behavior.
16. The appellant has referred me to other similar proposal in Parkfield Avenue found acceptable by the Council. Whatever the background to those cases, I do not consider them an appropriate justification for permitting the development proposed here which I have considered on its individual planning merits.

Conclusions

17. Having regard to all matters I have concluded that the proposal would not prejudice the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers, but it would result in unacceptable harm to the architectural integrity of the host building and the character and appearance of the street scene and the wider area. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR