
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2017

by G J Fort BA PGDip LLM MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/16/3165377
119 The Drive, Feltham TW14 0AH

- 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 Miss N Magdalena against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00386/119/P1, dated 16 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey part side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single-storey part side and rear extension at 119 The Drive, Feltham TW14 0AH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00386/119/P1, dated 16 May 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan; Proposed Floor Plan and Elevations TD/01A.
 - 3) The materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby approved shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance of its host dwelling and surroundings.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is one of a pair of bungalows set back from The Drive. Like its attached neighbour the appeal dwelling is on a broadly L-shaped plan has a hipped roof and a prominent gable at the front, giving the pair a symmetrical character. In the immediate surroundings of the appeal dwelling, substantial two-storey properties, both semi-detached and in short terraces predominate. Side spaces are varied and incremental extensions to the sides and rears of properties are immediately inter-visible with the appeal property.
-

4. The proposed development comprises a flat-roofed extension to the rear and part of the side of the appeal dwelling. The side extension's front wall would be set back from the appeal dwelling's projecting front wing and would be topped by a pitched roof with a gable-end. The eaves of the front part of the side extension would be at the same level as the eaves of its host dwelling; but the proposed development's roof ridge would be considerably lower than that of the appeal building's gable projection. The eaves of the rear roof slope of the proposed gable end would join the flat roof of the side extension.
5. I note that the front wall of the proposed side extension would be on the same building line as that of the appeal dwelling behind its projecting gable. However, the proposed development would be set back considerably from the front wall of the host dwelling's gable projection, it would be set down from its ridge, and inset from the boundary. The modest proportions of the proposed development, combined with its siting would thus create a subservient addition, that would not undermine the prominence of the host dwelling's gable projection. Consequently, I find no harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling would occur as a result of the proposed development. As the gable projection would remain the dominant feature of the host dwelling's front façade, the proposed development would not upset the symmetry and balance of the pair of bungalows to any material degree, and thus would avoid harm in this respect also.
6. I saw that the roofs of dwellings in the environs of the appeal site are predominantly hipped. However, there is a much more mixed pattern of roof treatment on extensions and alterations inter-visible with the appeal site including some gable roofs. Within this mixed context, and combined with its modest scale, the proposed roof treatment would thus not read as an incongruous or discordant feature, either in terms of its host dwelling or the wider streetscene.
7. The rear element of the proposed extension would be of subservient scale and I saw that rear extension of a variety of scales, characters and detailing were immediately inter-visible with the site. Consequently, the proposed development to the rear would cause no harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surroundings more generally.
8. Thus for the reasons given above, the proposed development would cause no harm to the character and appearance of its host dwelling or its surroundings. As a consequence, the proposed development would not conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan (adopted September 2015), insofar as they seek, amongst other matters, to ensure that proposals for residential extensions respond to the context and character of their surroundings and do not harm the character and appearance of their host buildings.

Conditions

9. I have assessed the Council's suggested conditions against the criteria given in the National Planning Policy Framework which states, at paragraph 206, that conditions should only be imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning and the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.

10. In the interests of certainty, I have attached a condition which specifies the approved plans. In order that the proposed development is sensitive to the character and appearance of its host dwelling and its surroundings I have attached a condition requiring matching materials to be used in its external construction.
11. I note a comment from an interested party suggesting a condition to restrict use of the extension as a separate dwelling. However, given the proposed extension's modest proportions and functional relationship to the host dwelling I consider a condition of this nature to be unnecessary in this case.

Conclusion

12. The appeal scheme would not conflict with the development plan insofar as the policies that have been drawn to my attention are concerned. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

G J Fort

INSPECTOR