



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2023

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/23/3323083

38 Carlton Avenue, Feltham, Hounslow, TW14 0EG

- 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 S Vashisht against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00207/38/P2, dated 23 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 18 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is ground floor rear elevation extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a ground floor rear elevation extension at 38 Carlton Avenue, Feltham, Hounslow, TW14 0EG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00207/38/P2, dated 23 March 2023, 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; PP/20/23/01; PP/20/23/02; PP/20/23/03; PP/20/23/04 and the Fire Safety Plan - 'Means of Escape' and Fire Safety Statement
 - 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 Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area; and
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 40 Carlton Avenue.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located in a road comprising of similar properties.
4. Policies CC1 and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (2015) (LP) expect proposals (amongst other things) to respond to the context and character of the area in terms of design, whilst Policy SC7 requires residential alterations to complement the original building and harmonise with adjoining properties.
5. The Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (SPD) whilst non-statutory, provides useful design guidance. The SPD states that single storey rear extensions should be secondary to the main house and should not project too far from the rear wall of the original house. It sets out a maximum depth of 3.65m for single storey rear extensions to semi-detached houses. It advises that the height of the extension should appear in scale with and subservient to the host dwelling and also confirms that a flat roof is normally acceptable for single storey rear extensions.
6. The rear wall of the existing dwelling is staggered, which is a feature repeated on the adjoining semi, 40 Carlton Avenue. The proposed extension would similarly be stepped and would extend between 3.65m – 4.5m beyond the recessed element and about 3.7m beyond the other main rear wall. Depending on where the depth of the extension is measured from, it would exceed the depth of extension suggested as being appropriate in the SPD.
7. The proposed extension would have a height of around 3m and would sit well below the first floor windows as required by the SPD. It would have a flat roof design which the SPD confirms is normally acceptable on single storey rear extensions. I saw on my site visit that several other dwellings in the immediate vicinity of the site have been extended to the rear in a similar manner.
8. In my view the proposed extension would appear secondary and subservient to the main house as required by the SPD. Furthermore, it would be of a design and appearance that respects that of the host dwelling and other extensions that have taken place in the surrounding area.
9. In conclusion of this main issue, despite some conflict with the guidance provided within the SPD in terms of its depth, I find that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would comply with the design objectives of Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the LP.

Living conditions

10. The wall of the proposed extension along the boundary with 40 Carlton Avenue would extend for a depth of 3.65m in line with the advice contained within the SPD. It would then step in from the boundary by about 1m and extend approximately a further 0.85m into the site.

11. The closest opening to the boundary on the ground floor of No 40 is a glazed glass panel and patio doors. There is a double fence line along this part of the side boundary of the site, with a maximum height of about 1.8m. The proposed extension, with a height of around 3m at the eaves, would therefore extend above the fence.
12. However, the design of the extension ensures that the length of wall along the boundary would not exceed 3.65m as set out in the SPD. The remainder of the extension would be set in from the boundary by about 1m and given its limited additional depth and relative low height, I do not consider that the extension would be unduly prominent or visually intrusive when viewed from No 40 and would not lead to any significant loss of light to rooms within the house or its rear garden area.
13. I therefore conclude on this issue that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 40 Carlton Avenue. I therefore find that it complies with Policies CC2 and SC7 of the LP insofar as these policies seek to protect the living conditions of adjoining occupiers.

Conditions

14. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans condition is imposed for certainty. A condition requiring the use of matching materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the local area.

Conclusion

15. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR