
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2024

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/23/3335306

116 Hanover Avenue, Feltham TW13 4JP

- 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 Svitlana Knight against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow Council.
 - The application Ref 00551/116/P2, dated 15 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 16 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is for a single and two storey side and single storey infill extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single and two storey side and single storey infill extension at 116 Hanover Avenue, Feltham TW13 4JP, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 00551/116/P2, dated 15 June 2023 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: PA-2311-00, PA-2311-01, PA-2311-02, PA-2311-03, PA-2311-04, PA-2311-05, PA-2311-06, PA-2311-07, PA-2311-08, PA-2311-09, PA-2311-10 and reasonable exception statement.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matter

2. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') was published in December 2023, but there are no material changes relevant to the substance of the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

The appeal site is located within a residential street predominantly comprising semi-detached and terraced houses that have been altered and extended over time in

many cases. 118 Hanover Avenue has a single storey side extension adjacent and in line with the ground floor front elevation of the proposed extension.

4. No 116 has the benefit of a recent hip-to-gable roof extension and with a flat roof dormer to the rear. It has a projecting bay at ground and first floor level under a half-gable roof on the front elevation which is symmetrical in appearance with no114 adjoining. The extension would not project beyond this, being built in line with the remainder of the front elevation and also with the first floor set back, and ridge lower than the main building, I consider that it would appear subordinate in form.
5. I understand that Section 4.5 of the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines (REG) stipulates that extensions should normally be set back at least 1m from the main front wall of the house to stop the creation of a 'terracing effect' and allow the original proportions of the building to remain the prominent feature following the same principles as for ground floor side extensions. It stipulates that it is essential that a first floor addition is set back 1m from the front of the house regardless of the set back at ground floor. This is however guidance and ultimately each case must be assessed on its own merits. In addition, whilst it would clearly bring two storey built form right up to the boundary shared with 118 Hanover Avenue, on my site visit I saw many examples where previously separate dwellings now touch by virtue of side extensions and I consider that this forms part of the ultimate character of the locality.
6. I therefore find by virtue of the overall scale and form of the proposal that it would not represent a bulky, visually intrusive or incongruous addition with it appearing subordinate in form to the host dwelling and in harmony with the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
7. From this basis I find that the scheme complies with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 – 2030 which together recognise the context and varied character of the Borough's places and seek to ensure that all new development conserves and takes opportunities to enhance their special qualities whilst requiring that all alterations and additions do not harm the existing character and appearance of the building in its context which includes complementing the original building, harmonising with adjoining properties and maintaining the character of the general street scene.

Conclusion and Conditions

8. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
9. Other than the standard time limit condition, the Council has suggested a condition requiring external materials to be used in the construction of the extensions to match those of the existing building, and that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. I consider these conditions necessary in the interests of preserving the character and appearance of the area.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR