

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2024

**by D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 9 October 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/24/3347404**  
**81 Sunbury Road, Feltham, TW13 4PH**

- 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 Clark against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
  - The application Ref is 01080/81/P1.
  - The development proposed is the erection of single storey rear infill extension to the house.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of single storey rear infill extension to the house at 81 Sunbury Road, Feltham, TW13 4PH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 01080/81/P1, subject to the following conditions:
2. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location plan (unnumbered), Proposed block plan (unnumbered), 175-100, 175-101 & 175-102.

### *Informative:*

You are advised that the proposed development is noted within Council records to be located within 250m of a former landfill site. Therefore, you are advised that either the site is investigated for the presence of landfill gas to ascertain whether gas protection measures are required or that gas protection measures are installed as a precautionary measure. Please contact the Council's Land Quality Team on [landquality@hounslow.gov.uk](mailto:landquality@hounslow.gov.uk) if you require any advice.

## Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on a) the character and appearance of the host property and locality and b) living conditions of neighbours.

## Reasons

### *Character and appearance*

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached home with a large rear box flat roofed dormer and a single storey flat roofed extension across about half of its rear. Locally houses are generally semi-detached in various forms, frequently with bay window features, and the area is of established residential
-

character and pleasing mid density suburban appearance. The appeal property and its neighbour lie on larger than average plots because of the arrangement of an abutting short service road parallel to Sunbury Road. The proposal is as described above and would have a depth of about 4.9 metres and width of around 3.4m.

5. The Council considers the planned extension to be over-sized and of poor design, harming the visual qualities of the property and the wider area.
6. The appeal property is now a substantial structure with its original form, large dormer and ground floor extension. In this context the additional bulk sought would not appear over ambitious to my eye. A substantial garden would remain. The infill would complete the regularity to the rear in a relatively subtle and unobtrusive form. Not dissimilar rear extensions do feature locally and there is a range of rear building lines and detached garden structures in the vicinity, some of appreciable scale. The appeal property's rear elevation is not open to wide views and in any event the main original higher level rear elevation would continue to be clearly legible.
7. Hounslow Local Plan (LP) Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7, taken together and amongst other matters, call for development which relates to the form, scale and character of the original building and its surrounds. In all the circumstances I conclude that the appeal scheme would not conflict with these objectives.
8. The Council's *Residential Extension Guidelines* (the REGs) includes similar objectives. The scheme would appreciably exceed its 3.65m depth guidance. However, this is guidance, stems from 2017, and cannot be expected to cover every eventuality. In this instance I am satisfied that aesthetic aims of that document would not be breached by the appeal scheme.

#### *Living conditions*

9. The Council is concerned about impacts on residential amenity to those at the attached property No 83 to the south. The case is made that there would be overshadowing and an undue sense of enclosure.
10. Whilst the structure would be higher than the present boundary wall it would be flat roofed in form, on level ground and not of undue height. Importantly the extension would lie to the north of the abutting property; overshadowing would be minimal. There would be a degree of blinkering introduced to neighbours but extensive outlook above to the side and along the garden would remain. It is notable that gardens are relatively generous and No 83's would continue to offer a pleasing sense of openness and viewing envelope for those occupants. Arguably the scheme could enhance privacy for the nearest and most sensitive part of No 83's garden and glazed protrusion.
11. LP Policies CC2 and SC7 and the objectives of the REGs are all relevant under this issue in that taken together and amongst other matters they seek to secure development which would not be unduly harmful to residential amenity. Given the above I conclude that the proposal would not conflict with the policy aim of protecting living conditions or the parallel objectives of the REGs.

*Conditions*

12. The Council suggests the standard commencement condition and I agree with this and a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans as this provides certainty. A condition on matching materials is not needed as the application form specifies this. The Council suggests an Informative Note and given the potential land fill gas situation, in the interests of minimising risk, I agree it should be included in the Decision.

*Overall conclusion*

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and locality or on the living conditions of neighbours. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

*D Cramond*

INSPECTOR