

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2016

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/16/3158580

16 St Albans Avenue, Feltham, Middlesex TW13 6RJ

- 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 B Tickner against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow Council.
 - The application Ref 00972/16/P1, dated 3 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is for a two storey, part front, part rear, side extension to detached family dwelling.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling comprises a detached two storey house of an 'L' shaped plan on a large corner plot with generous spacing to its boundary shared with Conway Road. The extension would be constructed close to this boundary and would add significant mass to the host dwelling. I accept that the width of the two storey addition would be less than half the width of the original dwelling; however, it cannot be assessed in purely two dimensional form.
4. I note that the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines (2003) (REG) in respect of two storey side extensions highlight that it is very important that side extensions accurately reflect the design of the main house and remain secondary in their size and appearance. It also highlights that extensions should normally be set back at least 1m from the main front wall of the house to, amongst other things, allow the original proportions of the building to remain the prominent feature.
5. In this instance the proposed extension would be some 2m forward of the return that it would be built against. The requirement for this 1m set-back is reflected within the REG's advice on corner plots and which requires all extensions to be proportionate to the dimensions of the main house; this is

notwithstanding the acceptable distance between the proposal and the property boundary.

6. I find that by virtue of the depth of the extension it would appear excessively bulky in what amounts to a highly prominent location. Therefore, whilst I acknowledge that the detailed design elements of the extension would largely harmonise with the main dwelling, it would lack subservience to it and, therefore, I cannot agree that it would appear subordinate in form. This is notwithstanding the quite generous front and rear gardens that would be retained for the property. Further, I am not convinced that views of the projection could not be gained from the adjacent roads due to the relatively exposed nature of the flank elevation of the proposed extension when viewed face-on.
7. Consequently, the overall scale and massing of the proposal would have a dominant effect on the host dwelling which would create an incongruous feature within the street scene. On my visit I noted the extension to 22 St Albans Avenue, but it is not for me to comment on its architectural quality or otherwise and, in any event, each case must be assessed on its own merits.
8. Therefore, notwithstanding the fact that there is a variety of architectural designs and forms within the locality, I find that the proposal would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area, in addition to being contrary to the REG as highlighted above. The proposal would also conflict with Policies CC1 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan (2015 – 2030) which require that all alterations and additions do not harm the existing character and appearance of the building and its context; and have regard to, amongst other things, the scale of the principal building, ensuring subordination and seeking to secure development that sensitively and creatively responds to an area's character, by refusing poor quality design.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR