



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 March 2022

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/22/3291083

9 Queens Park Gardens, Feltham TW13 4JT

- 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 K Kemp against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00910/9/P3, dated 6 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is a part single storey, part two storey, side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part single storey, part two storey, side extension at 9 Queens Park Gardens, Feltham TW13 4JT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00910/9/P3, dated 6 September 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) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: location plan, and drawing nos HP 5543 Issue A1 - SH1, SH3, SH4 and SH5; and HP5543 Issue A2 - SH2.
 - 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 proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area, including whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the St Dunstan's Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires, in respect of development affecting conservation areas, that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area. Policy CC4 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015 to 2030 (2015) ('HLP') broadly reflects that approach in its requirement for development to conserve and take opportunities to enhance the character of conservation areas, and to respect the grain, scale, form, proportions and materials of the surrounding area.

4. The National Planning Policy Framework 2021 ('Framework') sets out at paragraph 199 that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, such as a conservation area, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
5. The appeal site lies at the edge of the St Dunstan's Conservation Area ('SDCA'). This is described in the St Dunstan's Conservation Area Appraisal 2018 as the focal point of Lower Feltham, which still has the form and grain of the rural settlement it once was, and which retains some key buildings and open spaces.
6. The host property comprises one half of a semi-detached pair. The building's two storey, hipped roof form, and its pebble dashed finish, is consistent with nearby properties within the SDCA along Queens Park Gardens, and with many other nearby properties outside of it. Most of these properties are arranged close to one another on narrow plots and have not been extended to the side, although the appellant's statement highlights two instances where they have.
7. The proposed two storey side extension would extend towards Vernon Road on this prominent corner plot. It would be set down from the host's roof by 0.33 metre, and its front face would be set in at first floor by about 0.7 metre. Those dimensions, and the width of its front face, which would be just over half that of No 9, would ensure that it would appear proportionate and suitably subordinate to the host. Its hipped roof form would also reflect the style of the host and nearby properties, and it would be faced with matching materials. As this is a wide corner plot, there would be no terracing effect.
8. As a result, whilst the numeric standards at Section 4.5 of the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2017 ('SPD') would not be fully met, having considered the proposal on its merits and with regard to the local context as required by the SPD, the scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the host or the area.
9. Consequently, it would accord with HLP Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 which, amongst other things and in broad terms, require development to respond to an area's character, with extensions which complement, and are subordinate to, the original building, and which harmonise with adjoining properties and the streetscene. Given that conclusion, it would also comply with HLP Policy CC4, and with the Framework's policies on design and heritage assets.
10. Turning to the matter of conditions, I have imposed the standard time limit condition and, in the interests of certainty, a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings. In the interests of the character and appearance of the host property and the area, a matching materials condition is also necessary. Finally, given its layout, I have no cogent reason to doubt that the extension would be occupied for purposes ancillary to the host. Its use as a separate dwelling would require planning permission. The Council's fourth suggested condition is therefore unnecessary.
11. I conclude that the scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the host or the area, and the appeal is therefore allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR