



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 May 2024

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/24/3341863

7 Roseheath Road, Hounslow, TW4 5HH

- 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 J Bhesania against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00959/7/P3, dated 18 January 2024, was refused by notice dated 14 March 2024.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposal of single storey side extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 5 Roseheath Road; and
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

Living conditions

3. The appeal concerns a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling which has a single storey extension to the rear. The proposal is for a single storey side extension which would be flush with the main front wall of the dwelling. It would extend beyond the original rear wall of the dwelling and would align with the rear elevation of the existing extension.
4. The proposed extension would extend to the side boundary of the site with 5 Roseheath Road. The appellant has highlighted that No 5 has been significantly extended through various extensions, including a two-storey side extension, hip to gable roof and rear roof extension with two front roof windows to the house (LPA ref. 00959/5/P6) and by a 6m deep single storey extension approved under prior approval application (LPA ref. 00959/5/PA2). The approved plans show no side facing windows towards No 7 and in respect of application 00959/5/PA2, a condition was imposed to control glazing and to prevent the insertion of additional side windows in the extension once built.

5. I observed on my site visit that there are three small, high level obscure glazed windows on the flank elevation of No 5, together with a larger side facing window towards the rear of the single storey extension. The appellant states that these windows were inserted in 2022. Of the high-level windows, two of these appear to be within the original two storey flank wall of the dwelling, with a further one within the single storey extension. I have no substantive evidence from the Council regarding the status of these windows such as whether they would all have required permission and if so, whether the Council intend to take any action, or indeed, whether permission has subsequently been sought. Therefore, I place only limited weight on the appellant's evidence and I shall assess the proposal on the basis of the plans and other information submitted to and determined by the Council.
6. A high brick wall currently forms the boundary between the appeal site and 5 Roseheath Road. The part two storey, part single storey flank elevation of No 5 is only set a small distance in from the shared boundary with No 7. The proposed extension would extend to the boundary of the site and its flank wall would therefore be very close to the small windows on its flank elevation. The flat roof section of the proposed extension would have a height of about 3.1m and it would, therefore, be higher than the existing boundary wall.
7. The windows concerned are small, high level and obscure glazed, and as such, do not offer an outlook. Furthermore, the amount of light received by them would be limited due to their size, obscure glazing and location on the side elevation of the dwelling where the amount of light received would already be affected by the existing two storey dwelling at No 7. The Council state that one of these windows serves a children's bedroom whilst representations from the occupiers of No 5 imply that the windows concerned relate to an 'ensuite children's bedroom' and common bathroom and that the obscure glazed side window is the only source of light through to the children's bedroom. The appellant disputes that the window is the only source of light to the bedroom but I have no substantive evidence that this is the case as internal alterations may have been undertaken within the property.
8. I do not have the benefit of a current layout for the neighbouring dwelling and I was not able to observe the appeal proposal from 5 Roseheath Road. However, based on the information before me, due to the very close proximity of the proposed flank wall to the side facing windows in No 5, I have to conclude that the proposal would result in a further loss of light to these windows. This would be particular concern in relation to the window providing the only light source to a bedroom and would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 5.
9. The larger window on the flank elevation on the single storey extension to 5 Roseheath Road would not be significantly affected by the proposal. Furthermore, this window is obscure glazed and appears to be a secondary window.
10. I therefore conclude that based on the information before me, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 5 Roseheath Road. Accordingly, it would be contrary to Policies CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (2015)(LP) and the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (SPD) which together seek to ensure that proposed

development minimises harm to neighbouring residents, such as avoiding an unacceptable loss of daylight/sunlight, outlook or by creating an unacceptable sense of enclosure.

Character and appearance

11. The Council's SPD whilst non-statutory, provides detailed design guidance on residential extensions. The proposed extension would have a width of about 2.45m and its height would be well below the eaves height of the first floor of the property. The proposed extension would therefore be proportionate and subordinate to the dimensions of the main house as required by the SPD.
12. The SPD also advises that single storey side extensions should be set back at least one metre from the main front wall of the house to stop creation of a terracing effect and to allow the original proportions of the building to remain the prominent feature.
13. Although the extension would not be set back from the main front wall of the dwelling it would nonetheless have the appearance of a subordinate addition with the two-storey bay window and front porch remaining the most prominent features of the existing dwelling. Whilst the extension would be close to the two storey flank wall of 5 Roseheath Road, No 5 also has a prominent projecting two storey bay on its front elevation close to the boundary with No 7 and I am satisfied that the single storey extension is of a scale and height which would not lead to an undue 'terracing effect' between the two properties.
14. Whilst 9 Roseheath Road has not been extended to the side, it does have a prominent front porch which is of a different design and appearance to the porch of the appeal property and the appearance of the semi-detached pair is already unbalanced in this regard. In my opinion the proposed side extension, despite being flush with the main front wall of the dwelling, would not give rise to an unacceptable unbalance between the dwellings.
15. Furthermore, the appellant has also highlighted examples of single storey extension in the immediate area that are not set back from the front elevation. Whilst some of these may have been constructed under permitted development rights or before the adoption of the SPD, they do, nonetheless, form part of the character of the area.
16. Therefore, having regard to all of the above considerations, I conclude that despite some conflict with the SPD, the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. It would comply with Policies CC1 and CC2 of LP which expect proposals to respond to the context and character of the area in terms of design and Policy SC7 of the LP which requires residential alterations to complement the original building and harmonise with adjoining properties.

Other Matters

17. I acknowledge that the proposed extension would provide an improved layout to accommodate the appellant's disabled mother. Whilst this is an important consideration, it does not outweigh the harm that I have identified above.

Conclusion

18. Whilst I have concluded that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area, it would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 5 Roseheath Road.
19. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR