



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 24 August 2021

by Mr A Spencer-Peet BSc(Hons) PGDip.LP Solicitor (Non Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/21/3271550

82A Fernside Avenue, Feltham, TW13 7BN

- 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 Konrad Mickiewicz against the decision of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00442/82A/P3, dated 9 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 2 storey side extension at 82A Fernside Avenue, Feltham TW13 7BN, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00442/82A/P3, dated 9 November 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby approved shall in all respects accord strictly with drawing numbers: Site Location Plan, Existing Plans AH795-01, Proposed Plans AH795-02 and Existing & Proposed Elevations AH795-03 received by the Local Planning Authority on 9 November 2020.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal building is an end of terrace two storey dwelling with single storey side extension. The appeal site is located on a corner plot within a residential area which is predominately characterised by two storey dwellings forming short terraces. Whilst the dwellings which form these short terraces are relatively consistent in terms of their original design and appearance, a significant proportion of dwellings close to the site, and situated at the end of short terraces, have been substantially extended or altered. The appeal scheme proposes the demolition of the single storey side extension to be replaced with a two storey extension.

4. Policy CC1 London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 – 2030 Volume One (the Local Plan) requires that developments sensitively and creatively respond to an area's character. Policy CC2 of the Local Plan promotes high quality urban design and architecture to create attractive, distinctive, and liveable places. Policy SC7 of the Local Plan provides that development should complement the existing building, harmonise with adjoining properties, and maintain the character of the street scene.
5. As noted above, a significant proportion of dwellings within this area have been extended and altered, and which includes substantial side extensions which exhibit a range of roof forms and designs. The proposed two storey side extension at the site would be the same scale as those other double storey side extensions within the street and immediate surrounding area.
6. The Council have referred me to the Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document: A Guide for Householders (2017) (the SPD). In accordance with the details provided in the SPD, the appeal scheme would be set back from the front elevation of the house and would include a step in the ridge line height of the roof. The appeal scheme proposes the use of materials that would match the existing dwelling and, given the set back of the extension and proposed roof form, would remain subservient in appearance to the host building. In my view, the proposal, which would increase the overall bulk of the appeal building, would provide better balance to this short terrace of residences, given that the scale and mass of the appeal building currently appears at odds with the other dwellings within this terrace.
7. Notwithstanding the above, the SPD further provides that side extensions on corner plots should be set in at least one metre from the side boundary and that extensions should be less than half the width of the main house.
8. The evidence before me indicates that the proposed extension would be wider than half the width of the main house, albeit by only a very small amount. However, the proposal would not extend the width of the property when compared to the existing position and therefore would have no greater adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area.
9. Furthermore, whilst it is noted that the proposed extension would not strictly accord with the SPD in terms of set in from the side boundary, the proposal would largely replicate the position of the existing extension and, for the reasons given above, would remain subservient in character and appearance to the host building. The preface to the SPD acknowledges that there will be instances where proposals do not accord 'with the letter of the Guidelines'. In light of these reasons, I do not find that this particular proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, the street scene or the short terrace of dwellings, with regards to scale, siting, character and appearance.
10. For the reasons given above, I find that the appeal scheme would not be dominant or visually discordant in terms of its surroundings and would not have a harmful effect on the character or appearance of the surrounding area, the street scene or the short terrace of dwellings which the appeal building is a component of. Consequently, I find no conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Local Plan and conclude that the proposal would accord with aims and objectives of the SPD.

Conditions

11. The Council has, within the appeal questionnaire, suggested standard conditions relating to the timescale of implementation, matching materials and the requirement to carry out the development in accordance with the approved plans. These conditions are either statutory in nature or reasonable and necessary in the interests of certainty and I will impose all those suggested with the standard wording.

Conclusion

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

Mr A Spencer-Peet

INSPECTOR