
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: 9 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3249487

17 Eversley Crescent, Isleworth TW7 4LR

- 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 Imran Qureshi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00423/17/P2, dated 15 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, side roof extension with two side roof windows to the house and a front porch, including alterations to the roof ridge/ eaves height, reduction in the size of sliding doors, the insertion of a roof light and rear window and the loss of the front first floor circular window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, side roof extension with two side roof windows to the house and a front porch, including alterations to the roof ridge/ eaves height, reduction in the size of sliding doors, the insertion of a roof light and rear window and the loss of the front first floor circular window at 17 Eversley Crescent, Isleworth TW7 4LR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00423/17/P2, dated 15 January 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1.500 A3; 1.1250 A3; A101; A108.
 - 2) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows/doors or other openings, other than those expressly authorised by this permission, shall be constructed in the development hereby permitted.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application relates to development that has already been undertaken. I have used the description of the development as set out by the Council, as I consider it is clearer than the applicant's.

3. The Council had previously granted planning permission for extensions to the property. What has been constructed varies from that approval in a number of ways and the proposal seeks to gain approval for the extensions as constructed.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the extensions on the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. Firstly, the Council's case is clear that they consider that the development does not have any unacceptable effects on the living conditions of neighbours. Having taken account of the form of the approved extensions, I consider that the variations which are represented by the appeal scheme do not bring about any unacceptable effects in this respect.
6. In relation to the 2 storey side extension, the Council indicates that the eaves level is 0.32m higher than the approval and the ridge height is 0.05m higher. In relation to the ridge height, I consider that the extension does not appear unduly high in comparison to the original house or compared to other extensions nearby. In addition, the difference when compared to the approval is almost negligible. With regard to the eaves, at the front the eaves appear to be the same level as the remainder of the house but at the side the level steps up. However, this is mostly obscured due to the proximity of the 2 storey side extension at No 19. In my judgement this has no negative visual effects on the locality or on the composition of the building itself.
7. As part of the development, the main roof over the original dwelling has also been replaced. The Council's figures, which are repeated by the appellant, indicates that the eaves height of the new roof is 0.05m higher than the original one and the ridge is 0.18m taller.
8. The appeal property is a semi-detached house and its attached neighbour at No 15 is of the same design as the original house. The roof form of this pair (and many others in the area) have separate ridges of the individual houses which run front-to-back; this results in a valley which divides the 2 higher sections over this pair. Therefore, the ridges are separated by the substantial roof valley. To the casual observer, the difference in height between the original ridge at No 15 and the new one at No 17 may go unnoticed. Even taking some time to observe the difference armed with the knowledge that one is taller than the other, the difference in height appears, at most, very marginal. In my judgement no harm arises from this difference. In addition, the marginal difference in the width of the front gable, said to be 0.05m, has no harmful effects in my view. At the rear, the difference is said to be 0.5m; although this is more noticeable, the rear elevation faces over rear gardens and a car park to a church. Having viewed the rear from the car park, I do not consider that the difference, when compared to the neighbouring property, gives rise to any harmful effects. I agree with the Council, that the difference in the dimensions of the as-built small front and rear gables in the side extensions, when compared to the approval, are not significant and have no harmful effects.
9. The front porch has been built larger than was approved by the Council. Notwithstanding that it projects marginally beyond the depth of the front bay, I

consider that it still appears subservient to the main house and does not appear unduly dominant. In addition, the Council has indicated that the side dormer, which partly fills the roof-valley between this and the attached neighbouring property, has been constructed with a "tiled skirt". From my own observations, I can see no harmful visual effects arising from the form and materials used in the construction of the dormer.

10. The Council have also made reference to the loss of the previous small circular window in the front gable. The appellant indicates that this could be undertaken without the need for planning permission, and this is likely to be so. In addition, there is no special protection given to this building or the area and whilst such features may be common to a number of the houses here, I do not consider that the loss of one window would have an unacceptable effect on the area.

Conditions and Conclusions

11. The Council has indicated that it would wish to see some conditions attached to any resultant planning permission. The development has clearly commenced and from what I could see, is complete, therefore there is no need for the standard time-limit for commencement. In addition, there is no suggestion from the Council that the materials used are unacceptable and I can find no reason to seek any amendments; therefore, a condition relating to materials is not necessary. I shall include a condition which identifies the approved drawings for the sake of certainty and I agree with the Council that a condition to control any additional windows/doors or other openings is necessary to protect the living conditions of neighbours.
12. I have taken careful account of other matters that have been raised, as well as the Council's conclusions on matters that it finds acceptable. I have found no other reason to object to the development.
13. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed.

ST Wood

INSPECTOR