



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 June 2019

by Rebecca Thomas MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/19/3228761

9 Granville Avenue, Feltham TW13 4JL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs P Tappin against the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00501/9/P1, dated 8 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed, but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is an end-of terrace modern dwelling with a gable feature. The street is residential with most being semi-detached or terraced properties. There is a similarity in building design with a variance in materials and various additions over time. Front gables are prominent, with some dwellings having attached garages to the side and others having various additions. Hipped gables are a key feature of dwellings in the street and the wider area.
5. The appeal proposal would extend the existing property to the side and rear by providing a two-storey element which would extend to the full height of the existing ridge line. The roof would be altered from a hipped gable to a full gable to the side. A dormer extension would be included to the rear. Whilst there are side extensions to nearby properties of various types, hipped gables tend to be retained and are an important part of the character and appearance of the street. The neighbouring property, at number 7, is extended with a flat roofed extension however retains the original hipped gable. The introduction of

the new gabled extension would introduce an unduly and incongruous feature which is not reflective of the character and appearance of the original or neighbouring properties.

6. Notwithstanding the Council's assertion that number 15 makes up the other end of the terrace, that property and its neighbour appear to have been extended and as such the gap between the two has been closed. I acknowledge that some of the original character and symmetry has thus already been eroded to an extent. Nevertheless, the end property, number 23, has a hipped gable to its roof. The loss of the gable end at the appeal site would further contribute to the unbalanced appearance of this terrace. I consider that the loss of the hipped gable feature would be harmful to the overall appeal building and the character and appearance of the street.
7. Whilst I was able to see that number 15 has a two storey extension to the side, and is similar to the appeal proposal in that the extension is flush with the front wall of the house, there are important differences. The roofline at number 15 remains low as seen from the street allowing the front facing gable to remain a key feature of the building. At the appeal site, the extension would reach the highest point of the ridgeline and would be a dominant and stark addition which does not reflect the low level of the extension at number 15, nor the hipped gable of the original or the end of the terrace. Therefore any symmetry restored through the appeal proposal is very limited.
8. The Council refers to its Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (December 2017) (SPD) and its guidance which requires the set back of two storey side extensions in order to avoid a terracing effect. I noted many varying types of two storey side extensions along Granville Road and other neighbouring streets which retain the hipped gable feature and tended to be set back from the main elevation of the original. Whilst the appeal site is already part of a terrace, the proposal would not provide any setback other than that created by the gabled windows to the front. Although this reflects the treatment at number 15, the proximity to number 7, combined with the height and gabled nature of the extension flush with the front of the house extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the street.
9. I note the appellant's reference to other properties nearby with two storey extensions where a hip to gable alteration has been included¹. However, I am not aware of the particular circumstances in these cases and in any event I must consider the appeal scheme on its own merits. The existence of other roof extensions in the locality does not justify the harm I have identified.
10. Policy SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015) (the Local Plan) deals specifically with residential extensions and alterations. It states that the extension and improvement of residential properties will be supported so long as the character of the area is maintained, and that the proposals complement the original building, harmonise with adjoining properties and maintain the character of the general street scene. The proposed extension would be highly visible and would result in harm to the existing character of the building and the street and would not have regard to the original form and as such conflicts with the requirements of Policy SC7.

¹ 23 Francis Avenue and 14 Guildford Avenue

11. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the appeal property and the area. Therefore, there is conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Local Plan and the SPD which expect new development to provide high quality design to create attractive and distinctive places and respond to the special qualities, context and character of places.

Other matters

12. The appellant has referred to lawful development certificates in the area which confirm that similar developments would be permitted development.² Nonetheless, I have not been provided with evidence to demonstrate that the appeal proposal would fall within the parameters of permitted development. At both these example properties, the extensions appear to involve roof extensions in the main, with space between neighbouring properties and limited extension beyond the roof. I have given these developments some weight but for the reasons outlined above they do not override my findings of harm in this case.
13. Despite being an extension which would make use of appropriate materials and would improve the living conditions for occupiers, and would not harm that of neighbouring occupiers, these reasons are not sufficient to outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the host building and area identified above.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons and taking account of other matters raised I conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Local Plan and the provisions of the SPD and that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rebecca Thomas

INSPECTOR

² 00501/94/LAW1 and 00952/76/LAW1