



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 September 2016

**by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 22 September 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/16/3153803**

**32 Kingston Avenue, Feltham, Middlesex, TW14 9SL.**

- 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 Mrs Clare Obeng against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
  - The application Ref 00668/32/P1, dated 10 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 June 2016.
  - The development proposed is for a part two-storey part single storey side and rear extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues in this case to be:
  - a) the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host building and thereby the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
  - b) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of number 30 Kingston Avenue in terms of its potential to be overbearing and visually intrusive.

## Reasons

### *Character and appearance*

3. The property the subject of this appeal, 32 Kingston Avenue, is one half of a semi-detached pair of two-storey houses, numbers 30 and 32.
4. The houses in Kingston Avenue, as well as some surrounding streets, were originally conceived, designed and built in the 'Moderne' style. This is characterised in this case by, amongst other things, 'sun trap' curved bay windows to the street frontages and simple curved projecting hoods to the front doors that are located to the side and not the front of the houses. In the case of the dwellings on the north side of the street, where the back elevation is wider than the front, curved corner windows are a feature of both the large rear reception room and the bedroom over affording views towards the side and rear.

5. The properties in the street have been subject to some alterations over the years including the replacement of the original metal windows and, in a number of cases, side and rear extensions including in one or two instances the replacement of the original hipped roof with a gable end to provide roof space accommodation. Particularly on the south side of the street, some residents have added porches facilitating the re-siting of front doors to the front of the houses. Nevertheless, when viewed from the street the cohesive design of the original estate has generally been maintained.
6. The appellant proposes a two-storey side and rear extension with a hipped roof to reflect that of the host property. A single storey flat roof rear extension is also proposed. The new additions would provide, at ground floor level, a larger entrance hall, utility room and cloakroom together with a large open plan kitchen and family room. The family bathroom would be relocated on to the first floor. In addition to a further bedroom, bedrooms 2 and 3 would be enlarged.
7. As designed, the extension would completely subsume the existing side projection resulting in the loss of the iconic curved corner windows at ground and first floor level. This would, in turn, lead to the repositioning of the front door and the loss of the curved door hood, all characteristic design features of this house and its neighbours.
8. When viewed face on from the street the side extension, in itself, would appear as a well-mannered addition. However, despite the set down of the ridge height of the new roof and the extension's set back from the main façade, because of the overall depth of the side extension, lack of any modelling, detailing and the limited fenestration proposed, it would appear as a bulky, unattractive and overly dominant addition. It would thereby cause significant harm to the architectural integrity of the appeal property, the semi-detached pair, the street scene and the wider surrounding area.
9. I conclude, in respect of the first main issue, that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the architectural integrity of the host property and thereby the street scene as well as the character and appearance of the wider surrounding area. It would therefore not accord with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), Policies SC7, CC1 and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (Adopted 15 September 2015) (LP) and the underlying principles of the London Borough of Hounslow Residential Extensions Guidelines adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (Adopted October 2003) (SPG) as they relate to the quality of development and the need for new development to, amongst other things, complement the original building and maintain the character of the general street scene while taking the opportunity to enhance their special qualities and heritage.

#### *Living conditions*

10. The proposed two-storey element of the rear extension has been designed so as to step away from the common boundary to number 30 as well as the existing first floor rear window serving the habitable room adjacent to it at number 30. As illustrated, a 45 degree line drawn from the centre of that window would not be broken by the proposed extension. Accordingly, in my judgement, the

extension would not result in a loss of daylight to the room served by that window. Further, I am not persuaded, based on the limited evidence to the contrary, that the proposed rear extension would be so visually intrusive and overbearing to any future user of that room as to cause significant harm to their living conditions in terms of a loss of outlook as asserted by the Council.

11. Furthermore, based on my observations on site, the existing extension to the rear of number 30 and the relationship of one dwelling to another, I do not consider, as suggested by the Council, that the proposed extension would have a harmful overbearing impact when viewed from the garden of number 30.
12. Accordingly, I conclude, in respect of the second main issue, that the proposed development would not cause significant harm to the living conditions of the residential occupiers of number 30 Kingston Avenue by reason of being a visually intrusive or overbearing form of development. The proposal would therefore accord with the aims of LP Policies SC7 and CC2 and the SPG as they seek to protect residential living conditions.

### **Other matters**

13. The appellant has referred me to extensions and alterations to other nearby properties, including number 34 immediately to the west of number 32. Whatever the background to those cases, the existence of substantial, unattractive, prominent and visually intrusive side, rear extensions and alterations in the same and nearby streets is not an appropriate justification for permitting another here.
14. Paragraph 7 of the Framework advises that there are three dimensions to sustainable development and at paragraph 8 to achieve sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously. The proposal may well fulfil an economic role. However, I do not consider that it would meet the objectives of either the social or environmental roles as the design would fail to result in either a high quality built environment or serve to contribute to protecting and enhancing the built environment.

### **Conclusions**

15. I have concluded that the proposed development would not adversely affect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. However, I consider that this factor is outweighed by the unacceptable harm that would ensue to the architectural integrity of the host property and thereby the character and appearance of the area if the development were to be built out. To my mind, despite the lack of objection from local residents, these are compelling objections. Accordingly, for the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposal is not in accordance with the development plan, when read as a whole, and that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Philip Willmer*

INSPECTOR