

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2016

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 3 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/16/3156887

93 Cygnet Avenue, Feltham TW14 0DU

- 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 M J Sekhon against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00331/93/P6, dated 6 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension (amendment to P/2014/2879).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end of terrace 2-storey dwelling situated within a predominantly residential area of similarly designed properties. The property is located on a corner plot with the front and side elevations facing towards the road. The side and rear gardens are separated from the adjacent footway by a mainly blockwork wall of varying height. However, the property and its gardens are elevated above the adjacent footway and this difference in ground level is accentuated by the gradient of the road. By reason of the level differences and siting, the rear and side elevations of the property are prominent features within the streetscene.
 4. Planning permission has been granted for a single storey rear and a 2-storey side additions to the property (Ref 00331/93/P3 rather than P/2014/2879). Although the full details have not been provided, an appeal for the erection of a 2-storey side extension and part single and part 2-storey rear extension was dismissed by a previous Inspector (Ref APP/F5540/D/14/2229569). The evidence indicates that the previous appeal scheme included single and 2-storey additions which would have had the development wrapping around the side and rear elevations of the property.
-

5. The proposed development includes the additions which are the subject of the extant planning permission but also includes a single storey extension to the rear of the side addition which would be of a similar design as the rear addition. When assessed as a whole, the overall scale of the proposed development would be neither small scale nor subordinate relative to the size to the host property. The scale of the alterations also appear to have been a concern to the previous Inspector. However, parts of the appeal scheme could be erected pursuant to an extent planning permission and this would be the appellant's fall-back position to which significant weight is attached.
6. Although seeking to address the Inspector's concerns about the design of the previous appeal scheme, specifically the 2-storey element that would have infilled between the rear and side additions, the proposed development would still result in a wrap-around extension whereby the side and rear extensions would meet. Based upon the observations made during the site visit, other dwellings situated at corner plots within the surrounding area have not been altered by the erection of a wrap-around extension.
7. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: *Residential Extension Guidelines* (REG) refers to side extensions to corner properties not normally wrapping around to meet a rear extension. The appeal scheme would conflict with this guidance. The design of the appeal scheme would result in a type of development that would substantially alter the simple form, character and appearance of the property.
8. By reason of siting and the difference in ground levels, the roof and upper parts of the appeal scheme, including the element creating the wrap-around form, would be visible from the road. The significant harm caused to the property's simple form, character and appearance by the wrap-around design of the appeal scheme would be readily noticeable from the road. The absence of other similar wrap-around extensions to dwellings on corner plots within the surrounding area and the visual prominence of the extended property from the road add to my concerns about the poor quality of the proposed development's form and design. The appellant's reference to the need for additional accommodation in the form of a study is demonstrably outweighed by the identified significant harm.
9. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 and the guidelines of the REG. Amongst other matters these policies require development to creatively respond to and maintain the character of the area, to respect the surrounding established context and to be of high quality urban design. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) core principle of securing high quality design. Accordingly, and taking into account all other matters including the Framework's presumption in favour of sustainable development, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR