



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2022

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18TH January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/21/3282907

115 Fernside Avenue, Feltham TW13 7BH

- 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 Vikram Karthikeya against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00442/115/P4, dated 23 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is a front porch and a single storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front porch and a single storey side and rear extension at 115 Fernside Avenue, Feltham TW13 7BH in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 00442/115/P4, dated 23 June 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) Other than as set out in condition no. 3 below, the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL-01, PL-02, PL-03, PL-04 and PL-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 on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The properties on Fernside Avenue mostly comprise two storey terraces or semi-detached pairs. Their front faces, which are often finished in render, contain a projecting gable with a bay window. However, the style of their front entrances is varied. Some have a simple canopy, whilst others have enclosed porches, some of which project slightly forward of, or attach to, the adjacent bay window.
4. The host comprises a mid-terrace property, finished principally in render and pebbledash, and with a characteristic bay window. However, to the side it has an undercroft beneath a first floor extension, which appears as a rather anomalous void in the streetscene.

5. The form and proportions of the proposed front extension would be similar to that at No 117, to which it would attach, and which the appellant maintains is immune from enforcement action. It would also be broadly comparable to one allowed at appeal at 213 Fernside Avenue. Whilst it would project slightly forward of the host's bay window and would, to a degree, diminish the prominence of that locally distinctive feature, in the context of the varied porches and front extensions in the area it would not appear out of place. Additionally, as a result of the enclosure of the ground floor void, the dwelling would better reflect the prevailing form of development in the streetscene.
6. The proposed rear extension would respect the style and general proportions of many nearby extensions on this side of Fernside Avenue, including the extension at No 117. I therefore agree with the Council that it is acceptable.
7. Whilst the proposed front extension would retain a small gap to the bay window, as it would project forwards of it, and would extend sideways to link to the side extension, it would not comply with the advice at paragraph 4.9 of the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2017 ('SPD'). However, having considered the scheme on its merits, in the context of this varied streetscene, the adjacent porch at No 117, and the incongruous undercroft, it would appear suitably subordinate, and would not harm the character and appearance of the host or the area.
8. Consequently, the scheme would not conflict with those parts of Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (2015) which state that proposals should respond sensitively to the site and its context, and that extensions should have regard to the quality, character, materials and scale of the principal building, whilst considering the design advice in the SPD. Dismissal of the appeal would not find support from paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions and Conclusion

9. Having considered the proposal on its merits, it would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area. It would not conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole.
10. Turning to the matter of conditions, the standard time limit is necessary, as is a condition, in the interests of certainty, requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings.
11. The Council has also suggested a condition requiring that the facing materials match those in the host, although that is at odds with the brickwork walls depicted on the drawings. Nevertheless, in an email dated 13 January 2022 the appellant states that he would be prepared to use matching painter render so as to avoid having to discharge a condition. Thus, in the interests of the character and appearance of the host and the area, I have imposed such a condition, and have amended the suggested drawings condition accordingly.
12. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR