

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2020

by S Dean MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3257102

63 Carlton Avenue, Feltham TW14 0EE

- 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 and Mrs Mykhaylo and Natalya Tsymbalyuk and Makogon against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00207/63/P3, dated 18 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is a second storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a second storey side extension at 63 Carlton Avenue, Feltham TW14 0EE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00207/63/P3 dated 18 June 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 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: No 01, No 02, No 06, No 07, No 08, No 09 and No 11.
 - 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The houses on Carlton Avenue are generally semi-detached with hipped-roofs, built on a consistent building line with a regular rhythm and form. The group of houses around and including the appeal site are on wider plots than elsewhere on Carlton Avenue, and as a result, have single-storey attached garages to the side, some of which have been extended above in a manner similar to the appeal proposal.
4. In this decision I have had regard to the Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (the SPD), as well as the particular circumstances of the site. The SPD sets out guidelines on the degree of

set-back and set-down which the Council considers broadly necessary to achieve good design. Although this proposal does not feature the degree of set-back sought by the Council in the SPD, it does include a step-down in the roof-line, and the upper-storey is set-back from the front wall of the garage and the bay window. As a result, the proposal appears subordinate and proportionate to the scale of the original dwelling and those which surround it. It does therefore achieve the overarching aims of the SPD to balance reasonable expectations for increased accommodation and maintaining a good quality, attractive street-scene.

5. I acknowledge that the proposal will result in a slightly unusual side elevation. However, as views of this elevation are limited by the spacing between the semi-detached pairs, I do not consider that this is in itself unacceptably harmful to the character and appearance of the area. In addition, this side elevation ensures that the front elevation is consistent with the established character and appearance of the street.
6. As a result, I consider that the proposal would neither harm the character and appearance of the area nor that of the house and its attached neighbour. The proposal does therefore comply with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030. These policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development proposals have due regard to the character and context of their surroundings, complement it, deliver high quality urban design, cause no harm to the character and appearance of the area, and have regard to the SPD.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, and planning permission granted.

S Dean

INSPECTOR