



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 21 September 2020

by A Parkin BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3255338
2 Ashley Drive, Isleworth TW7 5QA

- 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 & Mrs Sanj Kular against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref. 01531/2/P2, dated 18 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension at 2 Ashley Drive, Isleworth TW7 5QA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 01531/2/P2, dated 18 March 2020, subject to the following 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: Location Plan; and, 1660/5B.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including the significance of the Osterley Park Conservation Area (OPCA).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a large, 2-storey, detached dwelling at the junction of Ashley Drive and Jersey Road. Ashley Drive is a private cul-de-sac serving a small estate of relatively recent construction. It contains traditional, detached dwellings of various designs set within established gardens. A number of the dwellings have been extended.
4. The proposed development would entail the construction of a first floor side extension above an integral garage, on the northeastern side of the appeal dwelling. The front and rear elevations of the proposed extension would align with the existing first floor elevations. The scale of the proposal would also be sympathetic to the host building by following the existing roof ridgeline. Furthermore, the design, fenestration and materials would all be closely matched to the existing dwelling.

5. Consequently, the proposed extension would relate well to the host building and would not be out of keeping with the different dwellings elsewhere on the estate. The proposal would increase the massing of the dwelling on its northeastern side somewhat. However, the extension would be positioned within the existing footprint of the dwelling and so would not encroach into the garden space to its side, which widens towards the rear of the property.
6. There is also a substantial area of open space to the front of the dwelling, comprising a driveway, parking spaces and a landscaped area next to Jersey Road, with a slightly smaller walled/fenced garden to the rear. As such, the proposal would not dominate the streetscene or detract from its spacious character in this vicinity.
7. I do not consider that the existing dwelling has any particular sense of balance that would be adversely affected by the proposal; it has an asymmetric appearance in views from the front as well as from the rear. I am also satisfied that notwithstanding the generic guidance contained in the Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2017, the scale, design, massing and position of the proposal would be acceptable in this case.
8. There is very little information in the submitted evidence concerning the OPCA. From the map showing its boundary the OPCA is focused on Osterley Park House, a large building set within its own grounds, together with some of the surrounding streets and spaces.
9. Paragraph 201 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (the Framework) notes that not all of a Conservation Area will necessarily contribute to its significance. From the evidence before me it is not clear that the Ashley Drive estate contributes to the significance of the OPCA.
10. Nevertheless, the appeal proposal would be consistent with the existing character and appearance of the host dwelling and the Ashley Drive estate, including in views from Jersey Road. It would therefore preserve the character and appearance of this part of the OPCA and would not detract from its significance.
11. For these reasons the proposed development would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the area, including the significance of the OPCA. It would, therefore, accord with Policies CC1 (context and character), CC2 (urban design and architecture), CC4 (heritage) and SC7 (residential extensions and alterations) contained in the Hounslow Local Plan 2015.

Conditions and Conclusion

12. The Council has suggested a number of conditions be attached to any grant of planning permission, should the appeal be allowed, which I have considered in light of Government guidance and amended accordingly.
13. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition specifying the approved drawings would be necessary for reasons of certainty, and to protect the character and appearance of the area.
14. However, a condition requiring the materials to be used for the external surfaces to match those of the host building would not be necessary, given the annotation on the approved drawings.

15. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Parkin

INSPECTOR