
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2017

by Stephen Roscoe BEng MSc CEng MICE

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

Decision date: 5th October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3180387

4 Hartham Close, Isleworth, London TW7 5EX

- 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 Denis Kiely against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00564/4/P5, dated 7 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 3 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is back and side extensions to an existing single family dwelling house to provide enhanced living, kitchen and bedroom spaces.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The application drawings titles refer to 'Conversion to Flats' and 'Converted House' amongst other things. Whilst this may be the appellant's intention outside of this appeal, it is not a matter to be considered under the appeal. Furthermore, the detail on the drawings shows a traditional house arrangement rather than a flat conversion. I have therefore considered the appeal on the basis of the extensions alone as set out above.
2. The appellant and the Council have agreed to a changed description for the proposed development, and this has been used on the Council's refusal notice. I agree that the development is better described in the changed description as set out below.
3. The Council's refusal notice refers to Local Plan¹ (LP) Policy CC4. This policy however relates to heritage matters, and I do not consider it to be relevant to this appeal.

Decision

4. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey side and rear extensions at 4 Hartham Close, Isleworth, London TW7 5EX in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 00564/4/P5, dated 7 March 2017, and subject to the conditions listed at the end of this decision.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. The appeal property is situated at the end of a cul de sac and at the end of a row of similar semi-detached houses. It lies beyond the highway and its footpaths. The front

¹ London Borough of Hounslow: Hounslow Local Plan 2015 to 2030: September 2015

elevation of the appeal house is finished with painted brickwork and cladding between the first floor windows. It has the benefit of a single storey side extension. An area of playing fields lies beyond the end of the cul de sac, and the ground rises to the rear of the property with the garden terminating at the boundary of a railway line. The appeal house is therefore somewhat tucked into this corner of the cul de sac.

6. The proposal comprises combined side and rear extensions. The ridgelines of the extensions would be lower than those of the main house, and the proposal would therefore be subordinate to the existing building in accordance with LP Policy SC7. Furthermore, the front elevation of the first floor side extension would be set back from the front elevation of the main house, and this would reinforce the subordinate nature of the proposal. The front cladding would also continue onto the proposed extension, and this would respond to the architectural vernacular of the original building in accordance with LP Policy CC1.
7. The rear extension would include a gable at roof level. This would provide a book end feature to the row of similar houses and respond meaningfully and sensitively to the site in accordance with LP Policy CC2. The first floor element of the rear extension would also be set back from the boundary of the attached house by 3m in accordance with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance² (SPG). Furthermore, some 50% of the volume of the first floor element of the rear extension already has planning permission following a previous application.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. I further conclude that it thus would not conflict with LP Policies SC7, CC1 and CC2 and the Council's SPG.

Conditions

9. The planning application form advises that external materials would match those on the original house. I consider however that a condition in relation to matching materials would be required to protect the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. It would also be necessary that the proposed development should be undertaken in accordance with the approved drawings for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A condition would therefore be required to define the approved drawings.

Conclusion

10. Having taken into account all other matters raised, none carry sufficient weight to alter the decision, and my conclusion is based on the evidence before me in terms of policy as a whole. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Stephen Roscoe

INSPECTOR

² London Borough of Hounslow: Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Extension Guidelines: October 2003

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:
 - N1502/0B/01 G.A. of House as Existing
 - N1502/0B/02 G.A. of House as Existing
 - N1502/0B/03 Elevations and Section of House as Existing
 - N1502/1H/B1 G.A. of House Conversion to Flats as Proposed
 - N1502/1H/B2 Floor Plans of Converted House as Proposed
 - N1502/1H/B3 Elevations of Converted House as Proposed (Unaltered from Existing)
- 3) Notwithstanding condition 2, the materials to be used on the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building.
