

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2016

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 2 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/16/3156499
14 Crosslands Avenue, Southall UB2 5QY

- 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 Harinder Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00328/14/P6, dated 7 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. There are 2 separate appeals which relate to the property. These appeals have been assessed on their own individual planning circumstances.

Main Issue

3. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a much altered 2-storey semi-detached dwelling which includes a roof dormer, 2-storey side extension and a single storey rear extension. The original hipped roof has been altered to a gable roof form as part of the erection of the dormer. By reason of the alterations to the roof's existing form and bulk, the original symmetry of this pair of semi-detached dwellings has been materially changed, including when viewed from the surrounding gardens.
 5. The property is situated within a predominantly residential area of semi-detached dwellings which have been altered by the erection of side, rear or roof extensions. From what was observed, the rear extensions mainly comprise single storey rear additions. Any 2-storey extensions that projected rearwards are associated with side additions but their detailed planning circumstances have not been. It was noted that the depth of these rearwards projections are modest in extent.
-

6. The proposed development includes the erection of a first floor extension above part of the single storey rear addition. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: *Residential Extensions Guidelines* (REG) identifies that, in most cases, 2-storey and first floor extensions will be refused because of being intrusive. In this case, and as acknowledged by the Council, there is an ability to site the proposed extension away from the shared boundaries to avoid it unacceptably overshadowing or harming the outlook of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.
7. However, I share the Council's concerns that the projection of the proposed extension, from what would be the middle of this now extended property's rear elevation, would be an incongruous addition to a semi-detached dwelling. The siting and depth of the appeal scheme would not respect or reflect other rear projections associated with side additions of other similar styles of dwellings within the surrounding area. Further, the proposed extension would accentuate the existing unbalanced relationship between this pair of semi-detached dwellings. An unbalanced appearance would still apply even if the proposal for a hipped roof above the 2-storey side extension was allowed.
8. I also agree with the Council that, by reason of design, there would be a visually awkward relationship between the rear elevation of the dormer and the roof of the proposed extension. The roof of the proposed extension would merge with the dormer rather than the property's original roof. There were no similar relationships between dormers and 2-storey rear extensions noted during the site visit.
9. Although the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the occupiers of the neighbouring properties this matter is significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the harm which has been identified. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 and the guidelines of the REG. Amongst other matters these policies require development to creatively respond to and maintain the character of the area, to respect the surrounding established context and to be of high quality urban design. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) core principle of securing high quality design. Accordingly, and taking into account all other matters including the Framework's presumption in favour of sustainable development, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR