
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 February 2020

by Peter Mark Sturgess BSc (Hons), MBA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State.

Decision date: 19th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/19/3242872

2 Vicarage Farm Road, Hounslow TW3 4NW

- 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 Darshan Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01151/2/P13, dated 5 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission granted for the erection of a first-floor side extension at 2 Vicarage Farm Road, Hounslow, TW3 4NW in accordance with planning permission, Council ref: 01151/2/P13 dated 5 August 2019, subject to the following conditions;
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be constructed in accordance with the following plans: SC/02/2019/B (received as part of the appeal documents and showing a flat roof on part of the side extension); SC/02/2019/A, dated 26 July 2019.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials that match the materials of the host dwelling.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council has made reference in the officers' report to the difference between the proposal as shown on the roof plan and on the elevations on drawing number SC/02/2019/B dated 26 July 2019. It is clear that whilst the proposed two storey extension is capable of being constructed in accordance with the elevations it would be more difficult to construct the extension in accordance with the details shown on the roof plan. This matter has been clarified by the plans submitted with the appeal, where the roof plan is now consistent with the proposed elevations. The roof plan now includes an element of flat roof on top of the extension. The elevations remain the same as shown on the plans submitted with the application. As the elevations remain the same as the plans submitted with the application, and the Council were aware of this discrepancy when they made the decision on the application, I will decide this

appeal on the basis of the roof plan shown on the plans submitted with the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The part of the development plan which is relevant to this appeal is the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (HLP) (volume one) adopted in 2015. It contains policies to ensure, amongst other things, that new development sensitively and creatively responds to an area's character (CC1) and carefully considers its external appearance (CC2). Specifically, SC7 seeks to ensure that extensions to buildings maintain the character of the area and street scene, complement the existing building, harmonise with adjoining properties and be subordinate to the existing building.
5. The area around the appeal site is of mixed character with a station car park, flat blocks, terraced and semi-detached housing all located in its immediate area. The houses next to the appeal site have gabled roofs and are constructed of brick and tile, whilst the house on the opposite side of the road on the corner of Ambassador Close has a large hipped roof. There is no one clearly discernible character to the area.
6. Whilst the appeal property forms a terrace with the houses to its rear, on Dalcross Road, it clearly fronts on to Vicarage Farm Road, as that is where its drive, main entrance/front door are located. I therefore regard the proposal as a two-storey side extension.
7. The Council has raised the issue of the 'bulky crown roof' and the absence of first floor windows in the north elevation. I consider that the 'crown roof' created by the extension would not be prominent in the street scene as it would be set above and behind the tiled hipped roof that would surround it, much as the existing hipped roof surrounds the crown roof on the existing building. The predominant character of the finished extension would be that of a tiled pitched roof. With regard to the absence of windows in the first floor of the proposed extension I regard this as a side extension and as such it is normal not to have windows in a flank wall to prevent the overlooking of neighbouring properties.
8. The proposed extension would raise the existing side extension to two stories. It would be constructed of similar materials to the existing house. It would be most visible when the house is approached from the north, along Vicarage Farm Road, but from this direction it would appear subordinate to the existing house and harmonise with its appearance, as it would display a hipped roof, be set back from the front wall of the house, be set down from the ridge and be constructed of similar materials to that of the existing house. The rest of the site would remain unaltered, with a garage and a garden area to its north and areas of garden and hardstanding to its east and south. The openness of the of the site would therefore be retained.
9. For these reasons I therefore find that the appeal proposal is in accordance with the policies of the HLP as it would harmonise with its surroundings, be

subordinate to the existing building and maintain the existing character of the area.

Other Matters

10. I note that the Council has referred to the *Residential Extension Guidelines* (supplementary planning document) adopted in December 2017. I have had regard to this document in this decision. However, the guidance it gives has to be tempered by the circumstances on the appeal site and whilst I give it some weight in this decision, it does not alter my finding that the appeal should be allowed.
11. Whilst it has not been referred to in the reasons for refusal, the officers' report makes reference to the effect of the proposed extension on the outlook of No 1 Dalcross Road as being oppressive and harmful to the outlook of that dwelling as it is located less than 1m from the boundary of this property. No 1 Dalcross Road already has a wall approximately 2m in height within 1m of its boundary with the appeal property. The addition of two storey extension within 1m of its eastern boundary will not significantly alter the outlook of this property. It will retain a reduced outlook to the east and its existing outlook to the north and west. I therefore do not regard the proposed extension as being unacceptably harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of 1 Dalcross Road.

Conditions

12. In addition to the time limit condition it is necessary to ensure that the materials from which the extension is constructed are controlled to protect the character and appearance of the locality. For the avoidance of doubt, I need to cover by a condition the discrepancy between the roof plan shown on the plans submitted with the planning application and those received as part of the appeal.

Conclusion

13. I find that having regard to the development plan, when taken as a whole, the appeal should be allowed.

Peter Mark Sturgess

INSPECTOR