
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 November 2017

by S Jones MA DipLP

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

Decision date: 12 December 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3181632
20 Dale Avenue, Hounslow TW4 7ER

- 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 Mrs K Malkan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00333/20/P2, dated 5 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is ground floor front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for ground floor front extension at 20 Dale Avenue, Hounslow TW4 7ER in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00333/20/P2, dated 5 April 2017, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) No development shall commence until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached two storey dwelling with attached garage in a residential cul-de-sac among a mixed area of semi-detached, detached and terraced housing.
4. Having reviewed the plans for the proposed development and visited the site, the existing garage height, width, and roof would be unaltered. The external change to the garage would consist of the insertion of a new door and window and an increase in length to come level with the frontage. It would use materials to match the existing appearance. In their reasons for refusal the Council mainly relies upon their Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance document. However, considering these guidelines, the increase in

length at the front would still be subordinate to the main porch entrance to the dwelling, which is set forward of the dwelling. It would not impinge upon the main front building line or create a further porch. The second doorway would not lead onto the original front door as generally required, but insofar as the garage already had a door feature it could not be said to introduce an entirely new and unacceptable element to the frontage, and its appearance would largely harmonise with the appeal property. It would remain clear that there was a single main entrance to the dwelling via the existing projecting porch. It would not increase the width of the property. The properties next door have a front compound and long porch canopy across them which is the predominant feature of the corner of the cul-de-sac and this would remain well forward of the proposed development, so that the proposed development would have little significant effect at the location.

5. Furthermore, there is a wide variety of minor extensions and alterations readily apparent across the road and in the vicinity of the appeal site, so this development would not appear out of keeping or be particularly distinctive in the streetscene. The development would not be readily apparent from the front unless approaching the end of the cul-de-sac because the road layout and the projecting entrance porch mean the property cannot be seen from farther up the road. I consider it would be a minor change which would not dominate the character of the street. Consequently it would have a very limited effect on the general streetscene. Therefore I conclude that it would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property or the surrounding area.
6. Consequently as set out above I conclude the development would not materially conflict with the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan Policy CC1, CC2 and SC7 or the Residential Extension Supplementary Planning Guidance document.
7. I have taken account of the appellant's personal reasons for requiring the garage conversion. However, in the light of the lack of harm to character and appearance identified above, this has had no bearing upon my decision because I do not need to go on to consider whether there would be any other material considerations that would justify a departure from the development plan.

Conclusion

8. I have imposed Conditions in the interests of certainty and to secure a satisfactory final appearance to the development. I have not imposed a condition about cycle parking because transport considerations were not one of the reasons for refusal and, in the absence of any other information, I consider there would otherwise need to be a proper justification for requiring this. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

S Jones

INSPECTOR