
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 November 2016

by Patrick Whelan BA(Hons) Dip Arch MA MSc ARB RIBA RTPI

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

Decision date: 11 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/16/3160208

92 Shaftesbury Avenue, Feltham TW14 9LR

- 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 Tahir Muhammad against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01005/92/P6, dated 2 August 2015, was refused by notice dated 3 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and on the street scene.

Reasons

3. Shaftesbury Avenue is characterised by its long rows of pairs of semi-detached houses with front bays and hipped roofs set behind relatively short front gardens. The appeal site is on a short, block end to a street at ninety degrees, and in a section where the lateral plot spacing is greater than the norm, so much so that the gap to the side contains a double-width garage detached from the house, the redevelopment of which is the subject of this appeal.
 4. While the Council's assessment refers to the post-development garden area as being insufficient, its reason for refusal relates to the width of the side extension, its scale in proportion to the host building and its prominence in the street scene.
 5. I appreciate that the proposed side extension would be of similar width to the existing double garage, however the garage is a freestanding building well separated from the house, whereas the side extension would be attached. The garage reads as a separate structure, incidental to the house, whereas the proposed extension would merge with the host building. Contrary to the Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines 2003 Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) which suggests that the width of a side extension should be significantly less than the width of the house, the proposal would be almost as wide as the host building. The extension would appear disproportionately wide in relation to the host building and would imbalance its mass. This incongruity
-

with the host building would be exacerbated by its relative prominence, running flush from the front wall of the house, rather than being set-back from it, as advised in the SPG.

6. I note the appeal¹ on this site dismissed in February 2016, however, this was for a larger scheme, and it is unclear if the present scheme has addressed the points my colleague raised which remain relevant to this proposal. I have taken into account the existing structure, the width of the plot, the context of the surrounding plot development pattern, as well as the positive features of the proposal including the increased set-back from the side boundary, and its pitched roof to the front elevation. I have also given consideration to the extended, rear form of the bungalow on the adjoining corner plot which presents an element of horizontal emphasis in the street scene. However, the proposed extension would have a direct, over-prominent, and disproportionate relationship to the host building which these factors would not overcome.
7. The proposed development would be contrary to Policies SC7, CC1, and CC2 of the Local Plan 2015. These seek development that takes opportunities to enhance qualities that contribute to an area's character, respond sensitively to the grain and massing of surrounding buildings, and have regard to the character and scale of the principal building and be subordinate to it.

Other Matters

8. Whilst I have considered a neighbour's concerns in relation to parking provision, given my findings on the main issues above, these have not led me to a different, overall conclusion.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Patrick Whelan

INSPECTOR

¹ Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/15/3138796