
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 January 2018

by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDurp MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 February 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3180674

18A Dale Avenue, Hounslow, Middlesex 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 Mr G.S.Sihota against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00333/18A/P1, dated 13 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 10 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is single storey front extension to provide a new shower room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey front extension to provide a new shower room at 18A Dale Avenue, Hounslow, Middlesex TW4 7ER in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00333/18A/P1, dated 13 March 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: Site Location Plan, S1H/18/100 and S1H/18/200.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a modern two storey hipped roofed dwelling located in a set-back position at the end of a small cul-de-sac comprising three other properties of a similar design and appearance. The host building has a small porch and a forward projecting, flat roofed open canopy linking it to a flat roofed garage to the side. There is a paved forecourt providing off street parking and another garage to the front of the host building. The forecourt is enclosed by a brick wall with metal railings above and a metal gate. Two of the

other properties within the cul-de-sac have front porches, though of differing scales and designs.

4. The proposed front extension would be larger than other front extensions within the cul-de-sac. Though it would extend the full width of the host building, it would not extend forward of the existing flat roofed front canopy, part of which would be retained to the side of the extension and to the front of the side garage. The extension would have a hipped roof to match the main roof of the host building, the top of which would be below the first floor windows and it would be constructed from matching materials. Consequently whilst it would change the appearance of host building, I do not consider that it would be disproportionately large or significantly alter its overall appearance. Moreover whilst the proposed extension would be visible beyond the appeal site boundaries, the set-back position of the host building and existing boundary treatment means that the extension would not be intrusive or dominate the character and appearance of the street.
5. In reaching my decision I have had regard to the advice regarding front extensions and porches within the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines adopted October 2003 (REG) that such extensions should be minor and that normally planning permission will only be given for small front entrance porches. However the REG does acknowledge differing circumstances and states that larger extensions may be possible where building lines are staggered, as is the case with the proposal.
6. Taking the above matters into consideration, I conclude that the proposal would not have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host building or the surrounding area. It therefore accords with policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 and with guidance within the REG. These policies and this guidance require, amongst other things, development including residential extensions to be of a high quality of urban design and to conserve the character of the area.

Other Matters

7. I note that a letter of objection received by the Council raised concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on parking and regarding the current use of one of the garages on the appeal site for residential accommodation.
8. Whilst the extension would result in the loss of a small area of the forecourt, the proposal would not have a significant impact on the amount of parking available on the appeal site or increase the amount of parking required by the host building. I note that the Council raised no objections to the proposal in terms of parking and I have no reason to disagree with its findings on this issue.
9. Any unauthorised use of garaging on the appeal site is a matter to be investigated by the Council and is not a matter for me in determining this appeal.

Conditions

10. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council. I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring the extension to be constructed in matching materials. This is to protect the character and appearance of the host building

and the surrounding area. I have not imposed the condition suggested by the Council relating to the insertion of additional doors and windows as I do not consider the condition to be necessary having regard to the scale and position of the extension relative to the neighbouring properties and existing boundary treatment.

Conclusion

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

Beverley Wilders

INSPECTOR