The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 December 2020

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3256937
32 Springvale Avenue, Brentford, TW8 9QH

- 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 Vimal Thakkar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
- The application Ref 01050/32/P3, dated 21 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 June 2020.
- The development proposed is double storey side and part rear first floor and rear single storey extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for double storey side and part rear first floor and rear single storey extension at 32 Springvale Avenue, Brentford, TW8 9QH, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 01050/32/P3, dated 21 April 2020, and the plans submitted with it, 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: Location Plan; V/591/01; V/591/02; V/591/03; V/591/04; V/591/05.

    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 upon the character and appearance of the house and area.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site is at the end of Springvale Avenue where it meets the boundary with an adjacent industrial estate. The street comprises 2 storey terraced housing. The key characteristics of the host dwelling and other properties in the street are 2 storey bay projections on the front elevations. At the end of each terrace these had pitched roofs with the gable end facing the street. Front doors have porch canopies which are, in most cases, half hipped at end of

terrace properties and single pitched on mid terrace properties. The rear of houses varied significantly with some houses having rear single storey extensions and others with large roof dormers.

4. The proposed 2 storey side extension would join the first-floor rear extension, part of the roof of which would be flat. The Council is concerned that the first floor rear extension would dominate the rear elevation because it wraps around, and covers more than half the width of, the original house. It is also concerned that the roof would be out of character.

5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document - A Guide for Householders (December 2017) (SPD) advises that on corner plots wrap around proposals that connect a side extension to a rear extension will be refused because of their exposed location. However, the appeal site is not exposed.

6. A large industrial shed runs along part of the side and rear boundary of the site. Rear gardens of houses along neighbouring roads also back onto the side and rear of the appeal site with views between them largely obscured by mature trees along their boundaries. Views into the rear of the site are mainly limited to oblique views from the rear gardens of properties along Springvale Avenue.

7. The rear extension would not be visible from the street and would have no impact on the features that I have identified as key to the character of the area. It would be below the existing roof ridge, follow the existing eaves level and project no more than 2.5 metres from the rear of the property. In this regard it accords with the SPD. Furthermore, the flat part of the roof would not be discernible from most views. Where there would be views of the rear extension they would be partial, because of natural screening or the angle at which it would be seen, and at a distance such that it would not appear as a dominant feature.

8. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would be subservient to the original dwelling and would not harm the character and appearance of the house or wider area. As such there would be no conflict with policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015 2030) or the objectives of the SPD which support high quality sensitive design that is subordinate to the host dwelling.

Conditions

9. The 3 year period in which the planning permission may be implemented is a statutory requirement. Conditions should also be imposed to require the use of matching materials in the interests of appearance and to list the plans in the interest of certainty.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR