

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 April 2017

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 25 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3168472

30 Ridgeway Road, Isleworth, TW7 5LA

- 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 Robert Taberner against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00941/30/P4 dated 25 October 2016 was refused by notice dated 20 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of side dormer and part two storey, part first floor rear extension to detached house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of side dormer and part two storey, part first floor rear extension to detached house at 30 Ridgeway Road, Isleworth, TW7 5LA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00941/30/P4, dated 25 October 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: Drawing No's: 2178-E01, 2178-E02, 2178-E04, 2178-P01 Rev C, 2178-P02 Rev B, 2178-P04 Rev B and Location Plan.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and whether it would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Spring Grove Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached property situated within the Spring Grove Conservation Area (Conservation Area). The surrounding area is predominantly residential and formed of detached and semi-detached dwellings in an Arts and Craft style. Although there is variation in the built form of properties, the use of render alongside brick detailing and facing tiles gives the
-

area a cohesive feel. The properties are set on regular building lines behind front garden areas and the presence of street trees contributes to the established, spacious and verdant character of the Conservation Area.

4. The proposal includes a first-floor and a two-storey extension to the rear of the property. Whilst I note that it would extend to over 9 metres of the total width of the property which is around 12m, part of the proposal would be located above an existing single storey rear extension. Furthermore, I note the hipped roof design which would be lower than the existing main roof and follow its pitch to the sides. It would also be formed of two separate hipped elements on each of the first floor and two storey extensions. My attention has been drawn to the *Residential Extension Guidelines* Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) which states that as a guide, an extension should not be more than half the width of a house. I do not however consider the proposal, given its form and location to the rear, would harm the open and cohesive qualities of the Conservation Area. The extension would also follow the design characteristics of the existing building, including the use of appropriate materials, such as render.
5. I acknowledge that this element of the proposal would be visible from Ravenswood Gardens to the rear, but it would be seen at a distance and against the existing main dwelling, where it would have a subservient appearance given its lower roof form. I do not therefore consider that it would be an overly dominant or an incongruous addition to the property.
6. The Council have not raised any objections to the side dormer extension and I am satisfied, given its size, positioning and hipped roof design, that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be preserved.
7. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host property and would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the Council's Local Plan, which seek, amongst other matters, to complement the existing building and preserve or enhance the character of an area. Although it would not follow a certain guideline set out in the SPG, I do not consider that it would be contrary to its aims, which require development to not adversely harm the character of a building or an area. It would also not be contrary to Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to conserve or enhance the historic environment.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above and having taken into account all other matters raised, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

9. The Council have suggested a number of conditions. In addition to the standard time condition, the condition requiring matching materials is necessary in the interests of the appearance of the area. A condition is needed to secure compliance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

F Rafiq INSPECTOR