
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2017

by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDurp MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3180796

26 Northumberland Crescent, Feltham TW14 9SZ

- 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 R Cliff against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00820/26/P5, dated 6 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 2 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as single storey front extension to incorporate porch and further acclamation to the living space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension at 26 Northumberland Crescent, Feltham TW14 9SZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00820/26/P5, dated 6 April 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 035-3-001, 035-3-002, 035-3-003, 035-3-022 and 035-3-023.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development used in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However in allowing the appeal I have amended the description slightly to refer only to acts of development and for the purpose of clarity.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a two storey end of terrace dwelling with attached single storey garage positioned at the junction of Northumberland Crescent and Target Close. It is one of the end properties in a small terrace of four dwellings with the immediate surrounding area mainly comprising similar small terraces and semi-detached properties. A number of dwellings near to the appeal site have single storey porches and front extensions of varying scale and design, including Nos 28, 30 and 32a Northumberland Crescent. These contribute to the character of the area.
5. The proposed single storey front extension would span the width of the original front elevation of the host building. However it would be modest in depth and height with the top of the roof of the proposed extension being below the height of the bottom of the first floor window. The extension would be constructed from materials to match the host building, would have a hipped roof to match the main roof and the majority of roofs nearby and the proposed ground floor window would match and align with the existing first floor window in the front elevation of the host building. The extension would be very similar in scale and appearance to the front extension at No 32a and although No 32a is a detached property, it nevertheless contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
6. I note that the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines (REG) adopted in October 2003 state that normally planning permission will only be given for small front entrance porches and that front extensions that are larger than a porch will normally be refused because they stand out as unusual, bulky extensions that significantly change the appearance of the house and the street. However whilst larger than a number of front extensions nearby and within the terrace, the modest size, depth and height and the particular design of the extension together with the existence of a similar extension nearby at No 32a means that the proposal would not be bulky or incongruous. Consequently it would not be harmful to either the host building or the surrounding area.
7. Taking the above matters into consideration I conclude that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. It therefore accords with policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan and with guidance contained within the REG. These policies and this guidance seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development proposals including residential extensions are well designed in relation to the host building and respond to their context.

Conditions

8. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant plans as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring the proposal to be constructed from materials to match the existing building. This is having regard to the site location and in order to protect the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Conclusion

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

Beverley Wilders

INSPECTOR