



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 November 2023

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11.12.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/23/3326450

2 Myrtle Road, Hounslow TW3 1QD

- 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 Ghulam Raza Khan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00782/2/P1, dated 28 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 28 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property and the area; and
 - the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The host sits on a narrow plot, at the end of a long two storey, pitched roof terrace on the southern side of Myrtle Road. In the streetscene the properties have a fairly consistent form and appearance. However, to the rear, many have been altered, and I observed a number of flat roofed single storey extensions, and occasional rectilinear dormers.
4. The proposed extension would be sited above the host's existing flat-roofed single storey rear projection. Its flat roof would be in line with the host's eaves and set well down from its ridgeline, and the extension would have a limited depth.
5. Thus, although it would cover over half the width of the dwelling contrary to the paragraph 4.6 of the Hounslow Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2017 ('SPD'), having considered the proposal on its merits, it would achieve a broadly subordinate appearance. Consequently, whilst the appellant queries the weight to be attached to the SPD, in these regards the scheme broadly complies with its advice.

6. However, its high flat roof would be prominent when viewed from the public car park to the rear. In those views the extension's form would be markedly at odds with the principally sloping roofs above ground floor level on this property and others in this terrace.
7. I observed that the rear elevation of the terrace on Kingsley Road to the east includes a number of two storey flat roofed extensions. However, this scheme's rectilinear two storey form would sit awkwardly in the context of the long, largely original, and consistent first floor elevation of this terrace on Myrtle Road.
8. Consequently, even if matching materials were to be used, the scheme would fail to integrate appropriately with the host property, and it would harm the character and appearance of the area.
9. It would therefore conflict with those parts of Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (2015) ('HLP') which support high quality urban design; and which expect proposals to complement the original building, harmonise with adjoining properties, and respond to local character having regard to matters such as the layout, grain, massing and height of surrounding buildings.

Living conditions

10. The first floor rear window at 4 Myrtle Road ('No 4') closest to the proposed extension is set in from the common boundary. Given the extension's limited depth, and as demonstrated by drawing no. KHAN/PLAN/003, it would not breach a 45 degree horizontal line drawn from that window. No 4's ground floor rear window is closer to the boundary, and has a narrow aspect between two existing rear projections. However, given the set in of the scheme's side wall, the proposal would not significantly impact the already constrained outlook from there.
11. As No 2A Myrtle Road has a single storey rear projection, and it is separated from this site by a narrow passageway, the impact on those occupants' outlook would be even less.
12. For these reasons, having regard to the particular circumstances here, whilst the extension's width and its proximity to neighbouring properties would exceed the guidance in the SPD, the scheme would not harmfully affect those occupiers' living conditions.
13. As HLP Policy CC1 addresses matters of design and character, it is of little, if any, relevance on this issue. However, the scheme would not conflict with those parts of HLP Policies CC2 and SC7 which require development to consider the amenity of residents, and to minimise harm to them as a result of an unacceptable loss of outlook or an unacceptable sense of enclosure.

Other matters

14. In terms of economic benefits during construction, improving the occupants' living conditions, and making an effective use of previously developed land, the scheme finds support from the National Planning Policy Framework. However, given its small scale, those benefits would be very limited; and for the above reasons the scheme would conflict with the Framework's environmental objective.

Conclusion

15. Summing up, I have found that the scheme would not harmfully impact the adjacent occupiers' living conditions, but that it would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. The scheme's limited benefits would not outweigh the significant harm that it would cause. Consequently, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR