



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2023

by A Caines BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/22/3296213

328 Bedfont Lane, Feltham TW14 9NU

- 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 Mrs Diana Karcheva against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00094/328/P6, dated 28 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is double storey side and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling situated prominently at the corner of Bedfont Lane and Letchworth Avenue within an established residential area. It currently has a porch to the front, single-storey garage to the side, and a small single-storey utility extension to the side/rear. Although the garage extends up to the pavement edge of Letchworth Avenue, its single-storey height and limited length ensures that it is not an overly dominant feature at street level. The space above the garage also retains an appreciable sense of openness at the entrance to Letchworth Avenue and contributes to the general form and order of this street scene.
4. Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan (2015) (the LP) seek development that is appropriate to its context, and support the extension of residential properties where these do not result in harm to the existing building and surrounding built environment.
5. The Council also refers to its adopted Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (the SPD), which generally advises that extensions should complement the original building and maintain the character of the street scene. Specifically in relation to corner plots, it advises that side extensions should be set at least 1 metre in from the side boundary and at least 1 metre back from the main front wall of the house, regardless of whether there is an existing ground floor extension. It further advises that a side extension should not wrap around to connect with a rear extension. Given the role of this guidance in supporting Policy SC7 of the LP and its consistency

with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) aims to achieve well-designed places, I attach significant weight to the SPD in this appeal.

6. It would appear that the appeal scheme represents a reduced scale of development compared to other previously refused schemes at the site. Most notably, the two-storey side extension has been set back an appropriate amount at first floor level and the rear extension is single-storey across the whole of the rear elevation. Nonetheless, the proposal still constitutes a form of wraparound extension which the SPD specifically prohibits at corner plots. There is further conflict with the SPD due to the lack of any set back from the main front wall at ground floor level, as well as the minimal distance to the side boundary.
7. The SPD acknowledges that a proposal which is contrary to the guidance may sometimes be acceptable due to the circumstances of the site. However, the appeal property is in a highly prominent location and the proposed wraparound extensions would, in combination, represent an addition of considerable size relative to the existing building. Furthermore, the minimal separation between the flank wall of the extensions and side boundary would cause the development to appear unacceptably dominant at street level and result in a street scene that is materially more enclosed at this corner junction. The overall effect would be a design and scale of development that does not integrate sensitively with the host building and its context. Consequently, a departure from the SPD guidance is not justified in this case.
8. I therefore conclude that the development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. It conflicts with the relevant requirements of the SPD and Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the LP. Furthermore, paragraph 134 of the Framework states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents.

Other Matters

9. The Council raises no objection in respect of effects on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. From my own observations I have no reason to disagree with that assessment. I also recognise that the extended living accommodation would be beneficial for the occupiers of the appeal property, and that good levels of energy efficiency and fire safety are likely to be achieved in the development. Nonetheless, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified and the conflict with the SPD and development plan as a whole.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR