
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 October 2020

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 29 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3245643

2 Grove Road, Isleworth TW7 4JJ

- 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 Peter Flaherty against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00531/2/P3, dated 18 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is an extension to the roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an extension to the roof at 2 Grove Road, Isleworth TW7 4JJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00531/2/P3, dated 18 October 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) No development shall commence until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2018/0997/AC/01/A, 2018/0997/AC/01/B, 2018/0997/AC/02, 2018/0997/AC/03, 2018/0997/AC/04, 2018/0997/AC/05.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Spring Grove Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this semi-detached house which is located within the Spring Grove Conservation Area. The conservation area contains numerous buildings, many in residential use, in a variety of styles and designs.

4. The proposal would add a second floor element over an existing flat-roofed, first floor part of the house at the rear of the side section. The proposal would provide a small side gable (which would match an existing feature), a crown roof and a rear dormer. It would be possible to see part of the proposed extension from the street in views down the side of the property, next to its neighbour at No 2a.
5. The Council indicates that the fact that the attached neighbour at No 4 does not have such an extension would mean that the proposal would have a harmful unbalancing effect, detrimental to the conservation area. The view of the rear part of the side at the neighbouring property at No 4 is restricted by the size and proximity of No 6 Grove Road and I doubt if any part of such an extension at No 4 would be visible, other than perhaps a very restricted glimpse, even if such were to be constructed. Therefore, any visual unbalancing which may arise from the appeal scheme would be very difficult to perceive. In addition, the proposal itself would be set some distance rearwards and would not represent a prominent addition.
6. In viewing other properties within the conservation area it is obvious that many of them have been altered over time. In many cases this means that an individual property no longer represents an exact match to its neighbour. The appeal property is not an exact match to the neighbouring house at No 4. In my judgement the proposed extension would represent a relatively discreet addition which would have no harmful effects on the street-scene by itself. In relation to any unbalancing effects, it is not possible to view the sides of Nos 2 and 4 within the same view. Furthermore, views of the side of No 4 are so restricted that it would be virtually impossible to tell if it had a similar extension or not. Therefore, I see no harm arising from any unbalancing effects of the extension. As a consequence, I consider that the character and appearance of the conservation area would be preserved by the proposal.
7. In relation to what conditions should be attached to a planning permission, the Council has indicated that they would wish to include conditions to require control over the external materials and that the extension should be built in accordance with the approved plans. I agree that both are necessary so that the approval is adhered to and so that the extension has a satisfactory external appearance.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above I consider that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and I find no conflict with the policies referred to in the Council's decision. Therefore, the appeal is allowed.

ST Wood

INSPECTOR