



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2021 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by S R G Baird BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/21/3278722

17 Bridlepath Way, Feltham, TW14 8AL

- 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 Syed Adnan Aziz against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow Council.
 - The application Ref 00157/17/P2, dated 22 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. A Certificate of Lawful Development for the erection of a single storey side extension to the house and a single storey outbuilding for storage use incidental to the house was granted by the Council in July 2021 (reference No. 00157/17/LAW2).

Main Issue

4. The effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached property situated at the end of a cul-de-sac within an established residential area. The triangular corner plot borders an area of open green space to the south. The existing dwelling features a pitched roof and a protruding double storey front gable which mirrors the other nearby properties located on corner plots except No.20 Bridlepath Way.
 6. Section 4.4 of the 'Residential Extension Guidelines' Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) states that the height and width of side extensions should be proportionate and subordinate to the main dwelling with a separation of at least 1m from the main front wall of the house to avoid a terracing effect. The extension would project beyond the front elevation and fail to appear
-

sufficiently subordinate to the host dwelling. Whilst the appellant states that a sufficient gap is retained between the proposed extension and side boundary and that the development would mimic the original staggered front elevation, it would appear a dominant and incongruous addition that would harm the form and character of the host property.

7. The development would be visually intrusive and would detract from the strong symmetrical character of the surrounding context. It would be prominent from the nearby footpath as well as to surrounding properties due to the conspicuous position of the appeal dwelling.
8. It is acknowledged that a single storey extension projecting beyond the front elevation has been erected at No.20 Bridlepath Way. It constitutes somewhat of an anomaly within the built form at the end of the cul-de-sacs bordering the open green space. The proposal would further unbalance the original symmetry of the area and, in any case, it must be dealt with on its own merits and the fact that an extension has been constructed elsewhere is not, on its own, a sound reason to allow unacceptable development that conflicts with the SPD.
9. Given the above, the proposal would fail to adhere to the guidance set out in Section 4.4 of the 'Residential Extension Guidelines' SPD and harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area and streetscene. It would conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan- Volume One (2015-2030) which together seek to ensure proposals are well-designed and respect local context.

Recommendation

10. The proposal would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.
11. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

George Baird

INSPECTOR