
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2017

by Richard McCoy BSc MSc DipTP MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 27 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/16/3163697
5 Cranmore Avenue, Isleworth TW7 4QW

- 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 D Bhatia against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00318/5/P1, dated 23 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing garage and the construction of a bedroom en-suite.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of the existing garage and the construction of a bedroom en-suite, at 5 Cranmore Avenue, Isleworth TW7 4QW, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 00318/5/P1, dated 23 May 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 following approved plans: Location Plan and drawing numbers CA1, CA2, CA3, CA4, CA5 and CA6.
 - 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) No additional windows or other glazed openings shall be formed in the flank walls of the extension hereby approved and no additional doors inserted in the building without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. No. 5 is a semi-detached house that is located within a predominantly residential area. Proposed is the replacement of a garage attached to the southern flank of the house with a single storey extension that would project
-

beyond the front elevation of the house by around 3.4m. The appellant pointed out that the proposal is required in order that he and his wife (both elderly) might have a ground-floor bathroom and bedroom.

4. The proposed extension would be modest in scale and while it would sit beyond the front wall of the host, this would be ameliorated by the position of the dwelling on a bend in the road. The effect of this feature means that the neighbouring property at no. 7 sits well forward of no. 5, such that the proposal would sit behind the front wall of its neighbour. In addition, the close proximity of the pair of semis (nos. 3 and 5) to their neighbour at no. 1 means that they read as a short terrace. This would prevent the proposal from having an unbalancing effect on the host and its attached neighbour.
5. I note the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) *Residential Extension Guidelines* (adopted following a period of public consultation) states that single storey side extensions should be set-back at least 1m from the main front wall of the house to stop the creation of a 'terracing effect' and allow the original proportions of the building to remain the prominent feature. While the proposal would breach this detailed guideline, the SPG does provide for extensions to be treated on their individual merits. In this regard, I am satisfied that the proposal would not conflict with overall objective of the SPG as it would not stand out as an unusual, bulky extension that would significantly change the appearance of the host and the street-scene.
6. Accordingly, in my judgement, the site specific circumstances in this case are such that the proposal would not harmfully change the character and appearance of the area and would not conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the adopted of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030.
7. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in the light of the tests and advice within the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. I agree that conditions are necessary in respect of commencement time, relating the development to the submitted plans, matching materials and controlling additional openings in the interests of providing certainty, protecting visual amenity and protecting the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining dwelling.
8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Richard McCoy

Inspector