



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2024

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/24/3343078

47 Elmwood Avenue, Feltham TW13 7AN

- 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 A Chokshi against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow
 - The application Ref 00403/47/P1.
 - The development proposed is for a 2 bedroom house to the side of the existing property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on: -
 - (i) The character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.
 - (ii) The living conditions for the occupiers with particular regard to the National Described Spaced Standards.
 - (iii) Pedestrian and highway safety.
 - (iv) Carbon reductions and energy efficiency.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. No.47 is a semi-detached property which fronts Elmwood Road and is the same style as the properties within the gated community of Ordinance Close. Together with the semi-detached pair of Nos. 49 and 50 to the other side, these properties frame that entrance and have their rear elevations in Ordinance Close.
4. The proposal would create a two-storey extension which extends up to the side boundary. It would also project forward, replicating the design of the other half of the semi-detached pair. To maintain the roof pitch whilst incorporating the various extensions, the scheme is designed with a flat roof crown element. However, this would not be overtly visible, and the general form and materials of the proposed development reflect the existing property and those within Ordinance Close.

5. The side boundary adjoins the car park to the neighbouring block of flats. Thereby, while the extension would fully enclose the gap to the side of the property, separation and spaciousness within the street scene would be maintained.
6. The development is not designed to be subservient and, therefore, does not align with guidance within the Council's Residential Extension Guideline Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPD), which indicates that two-storey side extensions should normally be set back. However, this proposal is for a new dwelling rather than forming an extension to No.47, and the guidance also advises that permission may be granted without the setback where it is to match the adjoining property.
7. Currently, the two halves of the semi-detached pair are not the same. The alterations would create symmetry to the building as a whole, albeit the proposed front projection would not have exactly the same dimensions as that to No.18. Nonetheless, I do not find that the additions would be incongruous or overly dominant, and Elmwood Avenue exhibits a mix of property types and styles.
8. The resultant building would no longer match the other semi-detached pair (Nos. 49 and 50) although, given the separation, they are not seen together in their entirety in views along the street. Terraced properties of a similar form to the appeal proposal are found in Ordinance Close, and as the extension is to the far side, the physical and visual definition of the entrance would be retained.
9. As such, I find that the proposed development would sufficiently harmonise with the existing building and would maintain the overall character and quality of the area. The proposal would, therefore, accord with policies CC1 and CC2 of the Local Plan 2015-2030 (Local Plan), which promote high-quality urban design and development that responds to the character of the area, including the architectural vernacular and wider context.

Living Conditions

10. The new dwelling would have a gross internal floor area (GIA) of 58.6sqm. This is below the Nationally Described Space Standards and London Plan policy D6, which for a two-storey two-bedroom dwelling with 4 bed spaces requires a minimum GIA of 79 sqm.
11. While the appellant acknowledges the deficiency in size, and it is suggested that the property could have been altered to a one-bedroom dwelling, no amendments have been proposed, and I have to consider the proposal before me. Thus, the development would fail to accord with the space standards and conflicts with London Plan policy D6, which seeks to ensure dwellings have adequately sized rooms to meet the needs of the occupiers.

Highway Safety

12. Unfortunately, the proposal does not include any specific details of the proposed parking arrangements. Whilst the front garden area currently accommodates parking, it is to be subdivided with fencing. There is a lack of clarity as to where the two spaces indicated on the application form to be retained are to be positioned and their alignment with the existing dropped kerb.

13. As such, I agree with the Council that it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would provide appropriate parking provisions for what would be two 2-bed properties, and accordingly, there would be no harm to highway and pedestrian safety through vehicle manoeuvres or demand for on-street parking.
14. The proposal, therefore, fails to provide sufficient information for me to conclude that it would accord with Local Plan policy EC2, which, amongst other matters, seeks to ensure that developments meet the parking standards and the policy for vehicle crossovers and would not prejudice the safety of the transport network.

Energy Efficiency

15. Local Plan policy EQ1 and London Plan policy S12 promote carbon reductions and energy efficiencies. The Energy Statement refers to a 79% saving and proposes a contribution. However, it is dated 23 November 2021, predating the changes to the Building Regulations in 2022, and uses the incorrect baseline. There is also no indication of the mechanism for securing the contribution.
16. Energy-efficient measures are proposed to be incorporated within the development, but as the assessment is not based on the current requirements, I cannot be confident that the development would achieve the proposed outcomes. Whilst this could potentially be addressed through a revised statement, as I have found against the proposal on other matters, this is not a determinative issue.

Conclusion

17. I have found that the design of the proposed extensions would be appropriate for the character of the area. However, the size of the proposed dwelling would not meet the required standards, and there are inadequacies in the supporting information relating to highway safety and carbon reductions to demonstrate compliance with the relevant policies. Therefore, for the reasons set out, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR

