

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2017

by Christa Masters MA (hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 6th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/16/3162708
20 Burlington Road, Isleworth TW7 4LY

- 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 Sunhil Gupta against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00178/20/P5, dated 27 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of first floor side, conversion of the garage into a habitable room, single storey rear and front porch extension to the house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of first floor side, conversion of the garage into a habitable room, single storey rear and front porch extension to the house at 20 Burlington Road, Isleworth TW7 4LY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00178/20/P5, dated 27 July 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan listed: GSB/20/2016.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building.

Main Issues

2. Firstly, the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area. Secondly, the effect of the rear extension on the living conditions of the existing and future occupiers of the neighbouring properties.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property comprises a semi-detached dwelling set within a residential area. The dwellings are set within tight plots and a number of the surrounding properties have been sympathetically extended and altered to both the rear and the front over time. This varied style and design to the properties nevertheless forms part of the established character of the area.
-

4. The first floor side extension would be positioned over the existing garage. In common with a number of other properties along the street, the extension would sit flush with the host property. There is a bulky two storey side extension at No 22 which sits almost flush to the boundary with the appeal property. This is a flat roofed box like structure which does not in my view reflect the established character of the street. The proposal would be proportionate in scale and form to the host property. It would also have a lowered ridge height as proposed from the host property. I have taken into account the size, scale and proportions of the side extension proposed. In the circumstances of this particular site and in view of the factors outlined above, the proposal would not in my view cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area or the street scene generally.
5. The Council have expressed specific concerns that the proposal would create a terracing effect and have referred me to the Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Guidelines (SPG) 2003 on this matter. Section 3 advises that side extensions should normally be set back at least 1m from the main front wall of the house. The wording of the guidance allows for some flexibility on this issue. In this instance, as I have already highlighted above, the close relationship between the No 22 and No 20 already exists as a result of the large box like addition at No 22. I am not convinced that the proposal before me would result in significant additional material harm in this regard.
6. In terms of the rear extension, this would be single storey and wrap around the dwelling to the rear. I am of the view that the proposal provides a contemporary design solution to this suburban site. The proposal would be proportionate in scale and form to the host property. The front porch proposed is modest in scale and form and can also be described as proportionate to the host property. It is also a common feature along Burlington Road. On balance, I am unable to agree that these additions to the property would cause material harm to the host property or street scene overall.
7. To conclude, I therefore find in relation to the first main issue the proposal would not cause any material harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would as a result, accord with policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan (LP). Policy CC1 is a general policy concerning context and character. It advises, amongst other things, that that the Council will seek to ensure that new development preserves and enhances the special qualities of an area. Policy CC2 is an urban design and architecture policy which seeks to promote and support high quality design and architecture to create attractive, distinctive and liveable places. In connection with character and appearance matters, policy SC7 states that the Council will support extensions to householder properties provided the works maintain the character of the area.

Living Conditions

8. The rear extension would be at a depth of 6m. It would extend beyond the existing rear extension at No 18 which the Council have identified as being 3.65m in length. I acknowledge that this is larger than the 3.65m depth identified by the SPG for semi detached dwellings. However, in the case of this appeal, I note the single storey element of the proposal is the same depth and a similar height to that which has been approved under application 00178/20/PA2. I am satisfied that if the appeal proposal were not erected, there is a likelihood that this prior approval would be implemented. In the

circumstances of this appeal, I regard the likely erection of such a fallback as a material consideration to which I have attached weight in the determination of this appeal. In my view, it justifies a decision which would not be in accordance with this element of the SPG.

9. From what I saw on the site visit, there are no flank elevation windows to the existing extension at No 18. The primary source of light and outlook for this property is therefore the rear elevation. As the proposal would be single storey, I am not convinced the proposal would result in the loss of outlook or light to the existing or future occupiers of No 18.
10. Turning to consider the effect of the proposal on the occupiers of No 22, the staggered nature of the rear extension would mean it would extend 4m from the rear of the existing property. There is an existing flank elevation window at No 22 facing the appeal site. This appeared to me to be a secondary source of light for the room it serves as the main source of outlook and light is the window located on the rear elevation. Taking into account the separation distance between this flank window and the appeal site, I am unable to agree with the Council that the proposal would cause material harm to either the outlook or light at this property.
11. I therefore conclude on the second main issue the proposal would accord with the development plan policies outlined above and in particular, policy SC7 of the LP which seeks to support householder extensions which do not result in harm to the amenities of neighbouring residential or future occupants. It would also accord with the Framework and in particular, paragraph 17 which seeks to ensure that proposals always secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Conditions

12. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by both the Council and appellant in light of paragraph 206 of the Framework. A condition limiting the life of the permission is necessary. I also agree it is necessary to specify the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of the proper planning of the area. The Council have suggested a condition that all of the materials to be used shall match those on the existing property. I agree such a condition is reasonable and necessary in order to ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons outlined above and taking all other matters into account, the appeal is allowed.

C Masters

INSPECTOR