

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2024

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14.02.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/23/3328146

112 Cardington Square, Hounslow TW4 6AL

- 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 Jaspal Phull against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application, Ref. 00205/112/P4, dated 20 April 2023 was refused by notice dated 22 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is an extension to an outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that No. 112 Cardington Square is a semi-detached house with the front garden concreted over to provide forecourt parking in common with a number of other properties in the road. A concrete driveway to the flank of the house leads to a rear garden which has a large concrete yard adjoining a ground floor rear extension of a substantial size.
 4. The remainder of the garden is divided into the existing outbuilding and a lawn and the appeal scheme seeks to extend the rear half of this structure across the full width of the garden to adjoin the outbuilding at the adjoining No. 114.
 5. The officers' report on the application and the Refusal Notice refer to three policies of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030. These are Policies CC1 (Context and Character); CC2 (Urban Design and Architecture), and SC7 (Residential Extensions and Alterations). In addition there is a Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Extension Guidelines'.
 6. When taken together and applied to the appeal proposal it is clear that the thrust of these policies and guidance is to ensure that development proposals maintain or enhance the amenity, environmental quality and overall character of the area, whilst at the same time allowing for reasonable increases in living/ancillary floor area for local residents.
-

7. However, having regard to a combination of the rear extension occupying a significant part of the original rear garden and the 'unsympathetic' hard surfacing of an extensive area to the front, side and rear of the dwelling, I consider that the appeal dwelling already performs poorly when assessed against the adopted policies and guidance to maintain the character and appearance of the area.
8. Whilst not all of the changes to the original dwelling and curtilage have been within the scope of planning control, the fact remains that the existing lawn provides some mitigation for this poor level of outdoor recreational and visual amenity, which together comprise the main elements of the impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.
9. I acknowledge that there are properties in the road that may already have a larger outbuilding than that currently proposed at No. 112. However, from the Google Earth photograph supplied as part of the appeal it appears that most of these dwellings also have a reasonably sized rear garden useable for the occupiers.
10. Furthermore, in this appeal the loss of the rear part of the open space to extend the existing building would compound the imbalance between amenity and living space. This is contrary to the Council's guidance and policies to which I refer in paragraph 5 above. I additionally consider that the proposal would be in harmful conflict with Government policy in the Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed and Beautiful Places' in the National Planning Policy Framework 2023.
11. For the above reasons and having had regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR