
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 August 2020

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3254121

28 Steele Road, Isleworth TW7 7HN

- 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 Danny Lyonette against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01071/28/P2, dated 29 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a dormer extension over the back addition.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appellant has submitted a revised proposal with the appeal which seeks to vary the size of the extension from that determined by the Council. Advice published by the Planning Inspectorate in the '*Procedural Guidance: Planning appeals – England*' dated July 2020 indicates that if an appellant thinks that amending their proposal will overcome the reason for refusal, they should normally make a fresh application. It adds that the planning appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and that it is important that what is considered by the Inspector is essentially what was considered by the local planning authority and which interested people's views were sought. I am aware that the Council and others have not had the opportunity to consider and make comments on the revised proposal and so their interests may be prejudiced if I were to consider the revised scheme. Therefore, I shall determine the appeal based on the scheme that was considered and refused by the Council and not the revision contained within the appeal documents.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The proposal relates to this terraced house which has been extended at the roof level with a rear dormer. The rear of the property is clearly visible in public views from Honeywood Road. The appeal seeks approval for a roof level extension over an existing 2 storey rear-projecting element of the house. This would have a flat roof and would take a similar form of the existing dormer, to

which it would be attached. The proposed extension would have the same height as the existing dormer and the same dimensions in width and length as the existing 2 storey element.

5. Policies CC1 and CC2 of the Local Plan seek to promote high quality urban design and ensures that the qualities of an area are conserved or enhanced. Policy SC7 relates to residential extensions and refers to detailed guidance set out in Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD).
6. The Council's Residential Extensions Guidance was adopted by the Council in 2017 as SPD. In relation to roof extensions, it advises that these should appear secondary to the house and it offers detailed guidance which aims to achieve this.
7. I consider that the proposal would have a significant and negative effect on the property. It would appear cumbersome and unsympathetic to the existing house and those others within this terrace. It would dominate the rear of the property and would fail to comply with the policies set out above and would be contrary to the advice given in the Residential Extensions Guidance.
8. The appellant refers to a Certificate of Lawfulness for a similar extension to this property which was granted by the Council in January 2020. This scheme is capable of implementation and represents a 'fall-back' position to the appellant. I have given careful consideration to the fall-back scheme and note that it would be smaller in each of the 3 dimensions, when compared to the appeal scheme. Whilst these differences may be considered as modest, I believe that they would be noticeable and would mean that the appeal proposal would have a greater visual effect on the locality than the smaller scheme. Therefore, the existence of the fall-back does not compel me to look favourably on the appeal scheme.
9. I have taken account of all other matters raised in the representation and conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the locality and would be contrary to Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Local Plan as well as the guidance in the SPD. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

ST Wood

INSPECTOR