
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 June

by Rebecca McAndrew BA Hons, PG Dip Urban Design, MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/19/3226188
406 Great West Road, Hounslow TW5 0PB

- 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 Shehzan Ladha against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00505/406/P4, dated 29 September, was refused by notice dated 11 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is Proposed First Floor Side Extension to form 2 No. new Bedrooms - (re submission with amendments - Ref 00505/406/P3).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Procedural Matter

2. The Council has advised that Policy CC4 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015) (LP) has been quoted in error on the Decision Notice as this property is not located within a conservation area. I have therefore determined the appeal purely on the basis of the other Local Plan policies referred to within the reason for refusal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The proposed extensions would provide additional living accommodation to meet the special medical circumstances of a resident of the property.
5. Given the width and depth of the proposed rear gable projection, it would be a dominant and overbearing design feature on the rear elevation of the property. This elevation already includes a number of additions of varying form and design and the introduction of a projecting gable would have a cluttered appearance. Also, the roof of the proposed gable, the flat roof projection and the box dormer would sit uncomfortably close to each other and would constitute an awkward visual arrangement. Consequently, the rear gable would have an awkward and unduly dominant presence which would be at odds with the character and appearance of the rear elevation of the existing dwelling.

6. The rear part of the proposed first floor side extension would step out wider than the front part of the extension. This would lead to an overhanging roof arrangement and a high blank elevation facing towards the front of the property. This awkward design feature would be at odds with the appearance of the existing dwelling and visible from the streetscene. It is acknowledged that the existing single storey side extension includes a stepped footprint. However, given the low level and hipped roof of the single storey structure, it sits comfortably within the context of the existing dwelling and the streetscene. Consequently, in my view, this design feature would be harmful to the appearance of the existing dwelling and the area.
7. The proposed first floor side extension would be set down below the ridge of the existing dwelling and back from the front elevation of the property. As such, it would appear subservient to the existing property and therefore, in terms of mass and bulk, would sit comfortably within the streetscene. Whilst the width of the proposed extension would be wider than that of the adjoining property, No.404 Great West Road, this difference is marginal and would therefore be unlikely to imbalance the pair of semi-detached homes or be harmful to the appearance of the existing dwelling. I also acknowledge the proposed materials would reflect the existing dwelling. However, none of these matters outweigh my concerns regarding the overall harm the proposal would have upon the appearance and character of the dwelling and area.
8. I conclude that overall the proposals would harm the character and appearance of the site and the wider area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to LP Policies CC1, CC2 and Policy SC7 which, taken together, seek to secure high quality schemes which complement the existing dwelling and do not harm the character and appearance of the area.

Other Matters

9. It is noted that there are special medical circumstances associated with the proposal. I also acknowledge the information submitted regarding the additional costs and disturbance which would be experienced if the Council's suggested amendments to the scheme were implemented. I have carefully considered all information submitted in both of these respects.
10. Refusal of the scheme would engage Human Rights matters. Having regard to Article 8 and Article 1 of the first Protocol, there would be interference with the occupier's rights in respect of private and family life, and the peaceful enjoyment of possessions respectively. However, there is a legitimate aim in protecting the character and appearance of the area and the scheme falls short of acceptability in this respect. The harm would be permanent and long standing. Consequently, these personal circumstances do not outweigh the significant harm that I have described. Such a conclusion is necessary and proportionate in this case.

Conclusion

11. I have found the proposal would conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole. There are no other considerations which outweigh this conflict. I therefore conclude the appeal should be dismissed. The proposal would not unacceptably violate the family's rights under Articles 1 and 8. The protection of the public interest cannot be achieved by means that are less interfering of their rights.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR