



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 May 2017

by Peter D Biggers BSc Hons MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3170308

1 Burlington Road, Isleworth TW7 4LU.

- 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 Dr Shirjeel Tahir against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow Council.
 - The application Ref 00178/1/P6, dated 22 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is double storey side extension to residential property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the property and surroundings of Burlington Road.

Reasons

3. Burlington Road, where the appeal site is located, is comprised in the main of two storey, semi-detached and detached properties built in brick, render and tile. A number of the semi-detached pairs, including Nos 1 and 3, are built to the same design having a very strong front gable feature with two storey bay window and central chimney detail on the gable. No 1 is located at a prominent point at the junction of Burlington Road and Eversley Crescent. It has already been the subject of a large 2 storey extension to the side and rear. Although this is not matched at No 3 (the other house of the pair) the existing extension is set well back from the frontage and as a result the impact on the symmetry of the pair is not pronounced. Moreover the set back and the set down from the main roof ridge results in an extension that is well-mannered and subordinate to the original house.
 4. I have been referred to examples of other side extensions in Burlington Road and Eversley Crescent which the appellant considers justify allowing the appeal. Whilst it is true that there are other side extensions in the road, by and large these are not located in as prominent a position on a road junction and for the most part there is at least some attempt to retain a symmetrical approach to the scale of the extensions between the houses in the semi-detached pairs. Moreover some of the extensions referred to by the appellant are not necessarily examples of good design and so do not provide precedents to be followed in this case. As such I have determined this appeal on its own merits.
-

5. The *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) seeks a high standard of design in all development and requires proposals to take the opportunities available to improve the character and quality of an area. Policies CC1 and CC2 of the *Hounslow Local Plan* (HLP) in seeking to secure development that sensitively and creatively responds to a site's characteristics, constraints and layout and the character of the surrounding area are consistent with the Framework. Specifically in respect of extensions and alterations HLP policy SC7 seeks to ensure alterations and additions do not harm the character and appearance of the building and its context, complement the original building and maintain the character of the general street scene. The policy requires extensions to have regard to the quality, character, materials and scale of the principal building and to be subordinate to it. The Council has also published *Supplementary Planning Guidance – Residential Extension Guidelines* (SPG) to ensure such development is appropriate to the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area amongst other things.
6. The SPG advises that it is very important that side extensions accurately reflect the design of the main house and remain secondary in their size and appearance. This is particularly important in respect of properties on corner plots, as is the case with No 1, and proposals that result in an ugly or bulky extension to the street boundary will be refused.
7. I acknowledge that decisions in respect of the previous proposal (Ref 00178/1/P5) indicated that the footprint of the side extension as proposed would be acceptable and that the appellant now proposes a reduced height of the proposed extension in an effort to meet concerns. Nevertheless the scale, mass, form and design of the extension and in particular its roof would still sit awkwardly with the original house disrupting the well-balanced appearance of the existing side extension. Given that the proposal would be sited on a semi-detached property, where the neighbour at No 3 has only a small single storey side extension, the proposed extension would unbalance the symmetry of the two properties harming the character and appearance of the semi-detached pair and failing to complement the design of the original house.
8. The scale, height, width and design of the side elevation with its asymmetric double pitched roof would be dominant and obtrusive in views west along Eversley Crescent towards Burlington Road. In views from the south on Eversley Crescent, where both properties of the pair would be visible together, the appearance would be awkward and unbalanced. As such the proposal would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host property and this part of Burlington Road and Eversley Crescent contrary to HLP policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 and the Framework as well as the SPG guidelines.
9. It has been put to me that the Council failed to actively participate in exploring alternative designs that may have been acceptable. However the fact remains that no agreement was reached regarding a possible alternative scheme. I must therefore determine what is before me and the scheme as originally submitted.

Other Matters

10. I have had regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty contained in the Equality Act 2010 and understand that the appellant is seeking to make sustainable and effective use of an existing home and optimise the potential of the site, an objective which is encouraged by the Framework. Nevertheless I am not persuaded that the benefits which the extension would bring in maximising

floorspace outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the semi-detached property and its surroundings that would be caused if I were to allow the appeal.

Conclusion

11. I have considered the matters before me but for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P. D. Biggers

INSPECTOR