

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 January 2017

by Patrick Whelan BA(Hons) Dip Arch MA MSc ARB RIBA RTPI

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

Decision date: 17 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/16/3162650
215 Brabazon Road, Hounslow TW5 9LW

- 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 SS Bisla against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00139/215/P4, dated 19 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 September 2016.
 - The development is described as a part retrospective application for retention of single storey rear/side conservatory extension and internal alterations to result in single family dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear/side conservatory extension and internal alterations to result in single family dwelling house at 215 Brabazon Road, Hounslow TW5 9LW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00139/215/P4, dated 19 May 2016, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans: Location Plan 1:1250; 16/215/BRH/101 EXISTING PLANS; 16/215/BRH/102 EXISTING ELEVATIONS; 16/215/BRH/103 EXISTING PLANS; 16/215/BRH/104 EXISTING PLANS; 16/215/BRH/105 EXISTING ELEVATIONS; 16/215/BRH/106 EXISTING PLANS.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. At the time of my visit, the envelope of the extension appeared complete. For the avoidance of doubt, my determination of the appeal is based on the drawings submitted and not on the works as constructed. I have removed the references to 'retention' and 'retrospective' from the description of development in the formal decision.

Main Issue

3. The Council raises no objection to the internal alterations which would return the side extension into part of the dwelling. Accordingly, the main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the house and the street scene.
-

Reasons

4. The Council considers that the extension itself and the use of uPVC on its wall to the street are at odds with the form and character of the house and that its bulk and mass, in combination with the other extensions to the house, results in an incongruous addition.
5. I acknowledge that the house has already been extended, however, this extension, of relatively modest footprint and height, is not disproportionate to the volume of the house either on its own account or in combination with the other extensions. I appreciate that it fills the corner between a rear and a side extension and that it extends to the boundary on the back edge of the footway. However, given that the house already extends in 2-storeys sideways to the back edge of the footway, and the presence of the tall brick boundary wall which would screen most of its flank, the siting of the extension does not appear incongruous in the street scene.
6. I note that the roofs of this house and the main roofs of the houses in the area are generally pitched. However, the house immediately opposite, 217 Brabazon Road, appears to have a rear extension with a flat roof which is no less prominent in the street scene than the extension in this case. In these circumstances, I find no harm from the form of the extension to the character of the house or the street scene.
7. The walls of the house, as with the walls of the other houses with elevations to Alcock Road, are generally of brick. In this context, the wall materials of the extension have an important bearing on the appearance of the house and the street scene. Most of the rear elevation of this extension contains glazing, with uPVC spandrel panels at low level, which are relatively discrete and concealed in views from the street. However, the cladding of part of the street wall of the extension in white uPVC, as I saw on my visit, is incongruous with the materials of the house and at odds with the other materials in the street scene of Alcock Road. I find the use of uPVC for the flank wall to the street harmful to the appearance of the house and street scene.
8. Notwithstanding this, the application drawings state all external materials to match existing, which suggests that the flank wall to the street should be built of brick like the rest of the house, rather than uPVC. Brick, matching the flank wall of the house, would help to integrate the extension with the house and into the overall street scene.
9. As my decision is based on the drawings which accompany the application rather than the development as erected, I conclude that the development does not harm the character and appearance of the house and the street scene. There is no conflict between the development as described in the drawings and Policies CC1, CC2, and SC7 of the Local Plan 2015-2030. These say that the Council expects development to maintain the character of the general street scene and to carefully consider external appearance through the use of high quality, durable materials which add visual interest and richness to the street scene.

Conditions

10. The Council has suggested a number of conditions which it considers would be appropriate were I minded to allow the appeal. I have considered them in the light of the Planning Practice Guidance. In the interests of proper planning and for the avoidance of doubt, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. In order to safeguard the appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene, a condition requiring the extension be built in materials which would match the existing dwelling is also attached.
11. I note the Council's proposed restrictive use condition as it considers that the development is unsuitable for use as a separate dwelling. However, the application is not seeking a separate dwelling. Indeed, the Council acknowledges that the internal alterations shown on the plans, to which it raises no objection, would stop a separate residential use. In these circumstances, and on the evidence before me, it would be unnecessary to apply the condition proposed.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Patrick Whelan

INSPECTOR