



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 February 2022

by J Somers BSocSci (Planning) MA (HEC) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7TH March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/21/3285992

79 Gladstone Avenue, Feltham TW14 9LJ

- 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 Karta Sounthe against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00480/79/P1, dated 6 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a two storey side extension, front porch, part two storey, part single storey rear extension and addition of 2 sunlight tunnels and 2 roof windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the existing building and the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on the corner of Gladstone Avenue and Rosslyn Avenue. The local area forms a number of streets that contains formally laid out speculative housing which appears to date from the mid-twentieth century. The local area contains pairs of semi-detached dwellings which have a symmetry in their placement with a consistent building line and setback with front gardens and low boundary walls. There are also visual gaps to the first floor level in between properties where glimpses to the tops of trees in rear gardens are experienced and is a positive characteristic of the area alongside trees to front gardens and street trees. The pairs of semi-detached dwellings also have similar design characteristics with red roof tiles, the use of pebbledash, hipped roof forms, and a central coaxial chimney stack. Where streets intersect with Rosslyn Avenue, these pairs of semi-detached dwellings are positioned diagonally to the corner, creating a characteristic gateway entrance to these streets.
4. The appeal site is one of the characteristic pairs of semi-detached dwellings which are placed diagonally to the corner of Gladstone Avenue and Rosslyn Avenue where this placement is also replicated on the opposite side of the road. The appeal site due to its layout is therefore quite prominent in the street and displays a number of positive qualities which are experienced within the street scene, being one of the characteristic corner semi-detached dwellings and containing many of the important design elements and original roof forms

and visual gaps between properties. These positive elements reinforce the local character, appearance and distinctiveness of the area.

5. In undertaking extensions to existing buildings, the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (LP) Policies CC1 and CC2 are design led policies which seek to achieve high quality design for new development which reflects the existing character and context of the locality. LP Policy SC7 is specific to residential extensions and seeks that extensions do not harm existing character and appearance and also seeks that the Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (SPD) is taken into account in planning determinations. The SPD contains further specific guidance in relation to design principles and detailed design considerations where for extensions there is an emphasis on subservience and responding to the existing site and context of the locality. The SPD for corner plots emphasises that these sites need further careful considerations to their prominence within the street scene.
6. With regards to the two storey side extension, the SPD recommends a minimum setback of 1 metre, with the caveat that it could be more on corner plots given the prominence of such sites. Whilst the ground floor plans and applicant's Statement of Case (SoC) indicate that the proposed ground floor is setback 1 metre, this is not actually the case as the front wall is clearly in line with the existing front wall. I appreciate that the plans appear to be indicating in the elevations that the 1 metre includes a small lean-to roof in order to form a quasi-bay window, however this is not a full bay window, and in any event I am not convinced that the side extension is set-back 1 metre at ground floor level.
7. Furthermore, the proposed ridge of the extension would not be set down 0.5 metres as suggested by the SPD in order to reduce subservience. Whilst the width of the extension would appear appropriate, the lack of setback to the ground floor and to the ridge height would not allow the original proportions of the dwelling to be prominent, and would create a large amount of bulk and massing to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host building and the greater locality.
8. Turning to the proposed two storey rear extension, the proposal would result in the two storey side extension wrapping around the building into the two storey rear extension which projects for approximately half the width of the proposed rear facade. The proposed side and rear extensions would elongate the side and rear facades of the building to such an extent that the original proportions of the dwelling would be subsumed by the extension. The proposed rear extension when combined with the side extension would be clearly disproportionate and the additional visual bulk and massing would be unlike other extensions constructed within the immediate vicinity and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing building, and the local distinctiveness of the locality on this prominent corner location.
9. The applicant's Statement of Case (SoC) notes that there are two similar properties¹ which I am asked to take into account and give weight as further justification for what is seen to be appropriate within the area. In both examples the extensions are not analogous to the appeal site and the characteristic layout and relationship to the street scene. Whilst No.15 Richmond Avenue is a corner property, the ground floor is inset from the main

¹ 15 Richmond Avenue & 20 North Road

façade and does not contain the wrap around two storey rear extension component. Having considered both these examples, they are not analogous to the proposed scheme and do not assist in justifying the appropriateness of the proposed development at the appeal site.

10. Taking the above into account, the proposed two storey side extension would be incongruous to the existing building as a result of its lack of subservience regarding setbacks and roof height, which would be disproportionate to the existing dwelling, resulting in inappropriate massing and bulk which would be detrimental to the character, appearance and the local distinctiveness of the host building and the greater locality. Consequently, and in conclusion of this matter, when taking into account the elements of the side extension and the rear extension, the proposed scheme would not be in compliance with LP Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7, which is supported by the SPD as described above.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

J Somers
INSPECTOR