
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2020

by K A Taylor MSC URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Wednesday, 26 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/19/3241521
80-82 Kingsley Road, Hounslow TW3 1QA

- 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 Khan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00667/80-82/P19, dated 14 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first-floor rear extension to enlarge existing flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Issue

2. At the time of my site visit the neighbouring property at No.2A Myrtle Grove (No.2A) had constructed a first-floor extension. I note that the Council has referred to this development¹ in their evidence. However, this is not shown on the existing or proposed plans which accompany the appeal. Notwithstanding the above, I shall deal with the appeal on the basis of what I saw at the site visit.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located at the junction between Kingsley Road and Myrtle Road and consists of an end terraced two-storey building. The ground floor is in commercial use as a takeaway that fronts onto Kingsley Road and extends back along Myrtle Grove. Residential use is formed as flats within the upper floors of the terraced building. No.80 and No.82 Kingsley Road are bedsits and have been internally linked. There are a number of existing rear first floor extensions and roof additions to neighbouring properties.
5. The proposed development would be a first-floor extension to the rear of the building and enlarge one of the existing bedsits, albeit the proposed floor plans

¹ 00782/2A/P3

show it as a utility/drying room. The proposal would extend along the boundary of the main building and wrap around an existing rear extension containing the extraction flues. The extension would finish where the metal staircase is located to access the flats from Myrtle Grove. The proposed design incorporates a hipped roof and large amounts of tinted glazing on each of the elevations and is of a conservatory style.

6. The appeal site is a prominent corner location and the first-floor extension would be clearly visible from Kingsley Road, Myrtle Road and the public car park located to the rear. The existing extensions along the terrace appear similar and have a uniform appearance in terms of their bulk and form. The proposed extension would appear excessively bulky with large areas of glazing, and the design style of a conservatory would be at odds with other existing built forms along the terrace. It would therefore appear as an incongruous and bulky addition to the building and when viewed within the immediate and wider street scene.
7. Furthermore, the cumulative impact of the proposal and the existing extension on the building would result in an addition along the rear elevation being of excessive depth and scale. The extension would significantly increase the built form at first-floor level of the building and exacerbate the cramped nature of the site itself.
8. The proposal would infill the space at first-floor level between the building and No.2A. It would result in a very small gap remaining where the metal staircase is located. As such, it would significantly reduce the open space and important existing visual gap it shares. Moreover, the now first-floor extension at No.2A has significantly reduced the existing gap between the two properties and the proposal would result in an unacceptable effect on the separation of the building with No.2A, and its overall corner location. As such the small gap would not be sufficient and would be uncharacteristic to the detriment of the character and appearance of the building, existing neighbouring properties and the wider street scene.
9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed first-floor rear extension would harm the character and appearance of the building and wider area. It would be contrary to Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015-2030), adopted 2015. Which taken together seek development to maintain the character of an area; complement the original building, harmonise with adjoining properties and have regard to the quality, character, materials and scale of the principle building; be subordinate and not over develop the site.
10. It would also be at odds with the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document, 2003 at 4.6 for Two-Storey and First Floor Rear Extensions.

Other Matters

11. The appellant refers to the National Planning Policy Framework and achieving sustainable development in terms of decision making, achieving well-designed places; help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit with the overall form and layout of their surroundings. Whilst this may be the case, it is caveated, including that developments are sympathetic to local character and are visually attractive.

12. I note the recent appeal decision² at this site. The previous appeal was dismissed, but the design of the proposed extension is materially different to that of the appeal before me. In any case, I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above and taking all matters into consideration the appeal should be dismissed.

K A Taylor

INSPECTOR

² APP/F5540/W/18/3212920