
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 25 August 2020

by M Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 September 2020

Appeal A Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3245433

Madhuban, 63 Southville Road, Feltham TW14 8AP

- 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 Madhu Keesara against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01040/63/P1, dated 4 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of front porch, ground floor conservatory following demolition of temporary plastic roof and first floor rear extension.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3248948

Madhuban, 63 Southville Road, Feltham TW14 8AP

- 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 Madhu Keesara against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01040/63/P2, dated 26 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of front porch extension, erection of a single storey rear and part first floor rear extension.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of front porch, ground floor conservatory following demolition of temporary plastic roof and first floor rear extension at Madhuban, 63 Southville Road, Feltham TW14 8AP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 01040/63/P1, dated 4 September 2019, subject to the conditions set out in attached Schedule 1.
2. Appeal B is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of front porch extension, erection of a single storey rear and part first floor rear extension at Madhuban, 63 Southville Road, Feltham TW14 8AP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 01040/63/P2, dated 26 November 2019, subject to the conditions set out in attached Schedule 2.

Procedural Matters

3. As set out above, there are two appeals on the site. To avoid duplication, I have dealt with them together, but each on their own merits.
4. At the time of my site visit it appeared that a single storey, rear conservatory had already been constructed. I have however proceeded on the basis of the submitted plans and details.

5. Neither of the refusal notices refers to the proposed porch and the Council's Officer's Report confirms this element of both schemes to be acceptable. I agree that the porch is unobjectionable and as such confine my consideration below to the proposed rear extensions.

Main Issue

6. The main issue in both appeals is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

7. The appeal property is a detached, two-storey dwelling under a hipped roof, set alongside a pair of semi-detached dwellings. To the other side of the site was a building comprising flats, and the vehicular access to this neighbouring development. There was an attractive consistency to the appearance of the dwellings in the area, with a regular use of materials and uniformity of scale when viewed from the street.

Appeal A

8. The appeal scheme proposes the erection of a single storey conservatory to the rear, beyond a previously constructed brick finished, single storey extension, together with a first-floor extension over the previous addition. The conservatory, whilst resulting in a total extension beyond the rear elevation of approximately 5.4 metres (m), would not appear as an inappropriate or overly long addition to the property due to it having a different appearance from the previous addition, which reduces the visual presence of the total length. It would therefore not be out of proportion with the existing dwelling. Furthermore, given its location to the ground floor of the property, to the rear behind a close boarded timber fence, there is little visibility of this element from the street. In any event, given that I have found it to have an acceptable appearance it follows that it would not have a harmful visual effect when viewed from any vantage point in the surrounding area.
9. Turning to the proposed first floor extension, this would sit atop part of the previous extension. It would not extend beyond the rear limit of this brick-built addition, it would be set in from the side elevation of the host dwelling and would be substantially narrower than the rear elevation of the host property. Moreover, the roof would be set down from the highest part of the main roof, would be hipped replicating the existing main roof and the eaves would not extend above the existing. Taking all these factors into account, this element would have a subservient appearance.
10. The proportions of the original dwelling would remain readily appreciable and thus the extensions would not subsume these proportions. As such, taken individually and cumulatively, whilst they may extend into the rear garden further than neighbouring extensions, the extensions would be viewed as fitting, not bulky, additions to the property.

Appeal B

11. This scheme differs from that proposed within appeal scheme A, by way of a reduction in the length of the proposed first floor rear extension. However, as I identify above, the first-floor element would be set in from the side elevation and narrower than the rear elevation of the host property. The degree of

projection from the rear elevation within appeal scheme B would not be excessive and would not extend as far as the existing ground floor structure that accommodates the kitchen. As such, it would be viewed as a minor and subservient addition to the property. Moreover, as I have found above that the larger of the extensions, proposed within appeal scheme A above, would have an acceptable appearance and would not subsume the host dwelling, it follows that neither would appeal scheme B.

Findings on both appeals

12. In light of my reasoning above, I find that both schemes would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Thus, both schemes accord with policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (adopted 2015), insofar as these policies seek to ensure development takes account of context and character, delivers high quality urban design and that extensions to residential properties maintain the character of an area.
13. I acknowledge that the size of the extensions would be in excess of those advocated within the London Borough of Hounslow Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Extension Guidelines (2017), in terms of the length of projection from the rear elevation and the width of the first-floor extension. However, for the reasons given above, I find that the proposals would not be harmful additions and as such, in this case, I find good reason for departing from the general guidance contained within this document.

Conditions

14. In regard to both appeals, I have imposed the standard condition in respect of the commencement of development and, in the interests of certainty, plans conditions are also required. In the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area and the host property, I have also included conditions requiring the use of matching materials.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that both appeals should succeed.

Martin Allen

INSPECTOR

Schedule 1 – Conditions in respect of Appeal A Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3245433

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 scale location plan, XEVA/63SR/101 Issue A, XEVA/63SR/102 Issue A, XEVA/63SR/103 Issue A, XEVA/63SR/104 Issue A, XEVA/63SR/105 Issue A, XEVA/63SR/106 Issue A, XEVA/63SR/107 Issue A and XEVA/63SR/108 Issue A.
- 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.

Schedule 2 – Conditions in respect of Appeal B Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3248948

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 scale location plan, XEVA/63SR/201 Issue A, XEVA/63SR/202 Issue A, XEVA/63SR/203 Issue A, XEVA/63SR/204 Issue A, XEVA/63SR/205 Issue A, XEVA/63SR/206 Issue A, XEVA/63SR/207 Issue A and XEVA/63SR/208 Issue A.
- 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.