



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 April 2024

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21.05.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/24/3337288

8 Avenue Gardens, Hounslow, TW5 9RF

- 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 and Mrs Sandhu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00061/8/P3 dated 17 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is erection of a two storey rear and side extension with associated roof alteration to the house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a two storey rear and side extension with associated roof alteration to the house at 8 Avenue Gardens, Hounslow, TW5 9RF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00061/8/P3 dated 17 May 2023, and the plans submitted with it, subject to conditions set out below.

(1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

(2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing sheet 1 depicting proposed floor and roof plans (Job no: 8-23 Drawing no.007); Drawing sheet 2 depicting proposed elevations and sections (Job no: 8-23 Drawing no.007) and Drawing sheet 3 depicting location plan and proposed block plan (Job no: 8-23 Drawing no.007).

(3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the hereby approved development shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council changed the description of development from that stated on the application form. In the interests of clarity, I consider that the amended description accurately describes the appeal scheme and accordingly I have adopted an amended description in the heading above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and Cranford Village Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The site is within a predominantly residential area within the Cranford Village Conservation Area. In accordance with the statutory duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; I am required to have special regard to the effect of the proposed development on the character or appearance of the area.
5. Paragraph 205 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset when considering the impact of a proposal on such an asset. This is irrespective of the level of harm.
6. The Cranford Village Conservation Area Appraisal (2018) sets out different character areas, the appeal site lies within 'The Avenue character area'. The Avenue character area consists of The Avenue itself and its off-shoots and includes a westward stretch of Bath Road. The appeal site lies on one of the off-shoots in the cul-de-sac Avenue Gardens.
7. The Conservation Area Appraisal confirms that buildings in the area date from the middle of to the second half of the twentieth century. Most of the streets off The Avenue contain well maintained, detached and semi-detached properties of the 1930s.
8. Avenue Gardens is characterised by predominantly traditional semi-detached two-storey properties, forming a harmonious built form. Properties share common features providing a regular pattern of development.
9. My attention has been drawn by both parties to a recent planning permission for a similar development¹. The development before me is larger and includes a side/rear extension and a staggered roof form.
10. The staggered roof form would introduce multiple roof heights, notwithstanding this the introduction of the lower roof form reflects the design of the existing property. Whilst multiple staggers in roof design are not a common feature in the area, given the shape of the tapered appeal plot, the lower roof stagger set back from the highway would not be obvious in the streetscene and as such would not be incongruous or bulky to the existing property or the area in general.
11. The proposed development whilst larger than the approved scheme, would not be out of keeping with the scale of the existing property.
12. The proposed development includes the loss of a second chimney on the appeal property. I observed that semi-detached properties in the area share attributes. The adjoining property (No. 7 Avenue Gardens) retains a second chimney to the rear of the property. However, I also note that some properties do not have a second chimney stack, such as No's 3 and 9, or second chimney stacks are a smaller size, No. 1. Whilst the second chimney stack retains a symmetry between the appeal site and No. 7, I find that the removal of the chimney based on the existing appearance of the immediate area would preserve the Conservation Area.

¹ Ref: 00061/8/P2

13. The Council do not raise concerns with regard to the rear dormer or the set back from the principal elevation, from the information before me I do not disagree.
14. I find that the proposed development does not harm the character and appearance of the appeal property and Cranford Village conservation area.
15. There is no conflict with Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan, Volume One 2015-2030, which seek amongst other things for developments to harmonise with the adjacent properties, preserving the character of the streetscene and conserving heritage assets.
16. There is no conflict with the Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines (2017) which seeks amongst other things to ensure extensions are proportionate and subordinate to the dimensions of the main house and that developments would not harm the character of a conservation area or the building itself.
17. There is also no conflict with the Framework which seeks to ensure developments are of good design appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings and that the historic environment is protected.

Conclusion

18. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.
19. I have imposed a standard condition relating to the commencement of development and a condition specifying the relevant plans as this provides certainty. In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area I have imposed a condition concerning materials.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR