

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2016

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20TH December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/16/3158837

344 Twickenham Road, Isleworth, TW7 7DX

- 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 Darren O'Keeffe against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01137/344/P2 dated 5 April 2016 was refused by notice dated 6 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory, conversion of garage into hobbies room and formation of pitched roof over existing flat roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory, conversion of garage into hobbies room and formation of pitched roof over existing flat roof at 344 Twickenham Road, Isleworth, TW7 7DX in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 01137/344/P2 dated 5 April 2016, 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: Location Plan (Scale 1:1250), DOK/15/MA/01 and DOK/15/MA/02.
 - 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.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall be occupied solely for purposes incidental to the occupation and enjoyment of the existing dwelling at 344 Twickenham Road and shall not at any time be sold off, sub-let or used as a separate unit of residential accommodation.

Procedural Matter

2. Reference has been made to the appeal development potentially leading to the creation of a separate residential unit. The description of development on the application form and on the refusal notice, as well as details shown on the submitted drawings indicate that the appeal application is to provide additional
-

accommodation in connection with the existing dwellinghouse and I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

3. I consider the main issues are the effect of the proposed development on (1) the character and appearance of the host property and the area, and, (2) the living conditions of surrounding residential occupiers with regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling which is set back from the main Twickenham Road and accessed from a slip road. There are a variety of different house designs and styles in the area although nearby property's do exhibit distinctive projecting front gables like the appeal dwelling. A grassed area of open space is located to the front of the site which alongside front gardens that contain planting and vegetation, give the area an attractive, green and spacious quality.
5. The proposal is for a single storey rear extension which would link with the existing garage. The converted garage would have an additional door and a window to the front elevation which would be visible from the street. Whilst I appreciate the Council's concerns that a second door would give the impression of a separate dwelling, the positioning of this door and the extent to which it would be setback behind the main rear elevation of the dwelling, as well as the presence of vegetation along the site's frontage, would not make it readily appreciable from the street. I do not therefore consider that this element of the proposal would harm the character of the host dwelling or the area.
6. The rear extension replacing the conservatory would have a projection of around 4.1m. I acknowledge that this together with the link to the converted garage, would be large when compared to the depth of the original house. However, the rear extension would replace an existing conservatory and would largely infill an area between this conservatory and the garage. Whilst the existing flat roofed garage would be replaced with a hipped roof form, it would still have a subordinate appearance to the existing two storey house. I do not therefore find that the single storey development would appear as a bulky and incongruous addition on this, particularly given that it would be sited to the rear of the existing dwelling and largely screened from views along Twickenham Road.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host property or the area. There would be no conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Council's Local Plan, which support, amongst other matters, extensions and alterations to residential properties provided they maintain the character of an area. I also do not consider that it would conflict with the aims of the *Residential Extension Guidelines* Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG), which requires there not to be harm to the character of the house or local area.

Living Conditions

8. The rear extension would be sited close to the boundary with the neighbouring property at No. 346 Twickenham Road which has not been extended to the rear. The projection of the appeal proposal along the boundary with this neighbour would be in excess of the 3.65m maximum depth set out in the SPG. At 4.1m, it would however only exceed the guidance by 0.45m and I also note the mono pitch roof design which would slope down to an eaves height of 2.46m. Furthermore, I was able to see the neighbouring occupier has a wide, open aspect across their garden and I do not therefore consider that the development would be unduly intrusive or unacceptably increase the sense of enclosure.
9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would not cause material harm to the living conditions of surrounding residential occupiers. Of the Policies quoted within the refusal notice, I consider Policies CC2 and SC7 of the Council's Local Plan to be of most relevance. The proposal would not be contrary to these, which require, amongst other matters, that development does not result in harm to the amenity of neighbouring residents. Although the proposal would fail to comply with certain specific guidance within the SPG, it would not conflict with its underlying aims, which include the need to prevent a unacceptable harmful effect to neighbouring residents.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons above and having taken into account all other matters raised, including representations by the Residents Association, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

11. The Council have suggested a number of conditions. I consider the standard implementation condition and a condition for the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans to be necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I will impose a condition in relation to materials in the interests of the character and appearance of the host property and the area. A condition is also necessary to ensure that the development is used as ancillary accommodation to the main house. The wording of this condition has been altered for conciseness and enforceability without affecting its aims.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR