



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2023

by Ann Veevers BA(Hons) DipBCon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/22/3305949

Bedfont House, United Drive, Feltham TW14 9NZ

- 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 Kohli, Octa Asset Management, against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00094/G/P15, dated 30 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as 'The proposed development seeks planning permission for alterations and extensions to the existing building at Bedfont House, United Drive, Feltham, London TW14 9NZ. The proposed extensions would provide additional floorspace over three floors, which would allow the existing bedsit units to be reconfigured to provide improved living conditions for existing and future occupiers.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for a part one, part two storey extension with rear roof extension at Bedfont House, United Drive, Feltham TW14 9NZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00094/G/P15, dated 30 May 2022, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - Drawing No:127-3EX-00 (Location and block Plan)
 - Drawing No:127-3EX-01 (Existing ground floor plan)
 - Drawing No:127-3EX-02 (Existing first and second floor plan)
 - Drawing No:127-3EX-03 (Existing roof plan)
 - Drawing No:127-3EX-04 (Existing elevations)
 - Drawing No:127-3EX-05 (Existing section)
 - Drawing No:127-3GA-01 (Proposed ground floor plan)
 - Drawing No:127-3GA-02 (Proposed first and second floor plan)
 - Drawing No:127-3GA-03 (Proposed roof plan)
 - Drawing No:127-3GA-04 (Proposed elevations)
 - Drawing No:127-3GA-05 (Proposed section)
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development as stated on the application form is set out in the banner heading above. The Council on its decision notice has described the development as 'part one, part two storey extension with rear roof extension'. This more accurately describes the proposals as shown on the plans. I have considered the appeal on this basis and used the revised description in my formal decision above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The area in which the appeal site is located is typically suburban in character. It is predominantly residential, with a mixed appearance, arising from the variety of property styles, sizes and ages. The appeal site comprises an extended detached two storey building with a garden, occupied as bedsits. It is the only residential property directly fronting United Drive, a short street leading to a large, purpose-built extra care housing development known as Bristol Court.
5. The rear gardens of properties on Bedfont Lane are perpendicular to the appeal site with an access track lying in between, resulting in glimpsed views of the gable elevation of the appeal building from the street.
6. Although relating to house extensions rather than flatted development, the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (SPD) sets out that whilst proposals will be considered on their merits, they should appear secondary to the original house, and should reflect its design and character. It adds that second extensions added to existing extensions can raise design issues and will normally be refused.
7. The appeal proposal would be attached to previous extensions at the rear of the building, including a roof extension. I recognise that incremental additions could erode the original character and scale of the original building. However, due to its low height and recess from the sides of the building, the proposed roof extension would be compact and subservient in scale and form to the host building. The proposed first floor extension would result in a marginally greater depth than the existing building but would reflect the current roof form, and the ground floor extension would be a low-level flat roof addition that would be partially screened by the existing boundary walls.
8. In combination, whilst adding volume to the host building, due to the design and use of matching materials, the proposed extensions would harmonise with, and not dominate or erode, the character and appearance of the host building.
9. Furthermore, given the relatively solitary context in which the appeal site sits, the space remaining within the rear garden and the separation distance to surrounding buildings, the proposed extensions would not appear as a prominent intrusion in glimpsed views from the street. Even though the additional built form would be visible from nearby residential properties, due to its limited scale, it would not be seen as incongruous or excessive and would not harm the character or appearance of the area. In reaching this view, I have

also had regard to the adjacent large part two/three storey development at Bristol Court.

10. For the above reasons, having regard to the cumulative effect of the proposal and the context of the site, the appeal scheme would not harm the character or appearance of the host property or surrounding area.
11. Accordingly, the proposal complies with Policies CC1 and CC2 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (2015) (HLP) which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that proposals respond sensitively to the site and its context, having regard to matters such as the massing and height of surrounding buildings. It also complies with the approach set out in Policy SC7 of the HLP to maintain the character and appearance of the building and the area.
12. Whilst the proposal does not fully accord with the SPD, each case must be considered on its own merits, and based on the circumstances of the site. For the reasons set out above, a decision other than in accordance with the SPD is justified in this case, but it is based on the specific circumstances of the appeal site and the details of the scheme before me.

Other Matters

13. I acknowledge the concerns of a neighbouring resident regarding parking in the area. However, as there would be no increase in the number of bedsits, I agree with the Council's conclusions that the existing parking arrangements would not be affected.
14. The mis-direction of post, conduct of the owner, the maintenance and appearance of the existing property and refuse arrangements are not planning matters on which I can comment as part of this appeal and therefore do not affect my findings on the planning merits of the scheme.

Conditions

15. I have considered the suggested conditions from the Council and had regard to Paragraph 56 of the Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance in terms of the use of planning conditions. I have undertaken some minor editing and rationalisation of the conditions proposed by the Council in the interests of precision and clarity.
16. In addition to the standard condition limiting the lifespan of the planning permission, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty and a condition requiring details of materials, in order to protect the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Conclusion

17. The proposal would accord with the development plan, and there are no material considerations that indicate that a contrary decision should be taken. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal should be allowed.

Ann Veevers

INSPECTOR