



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2021

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/21/3272517

36 Northumberland Avenue, Isleworth, Middlesex TW7 5HU

- 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 Mrs S Dattani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref: 00819/36/P6, dated 1 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is 2 No. 2 storey side extensions to detached house and a rear dormer loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached house that lies on a large corner plot. It is mainly of a 2 storey construction with single storey elements on one side. It faces the crossroads of Northumberland and Roxborough avenues at an angle and when this is considered with the lack of substantive screening along its frontages, it is a prominent building. The surroundings comprise mainly of semi-detached properties, a number of which have been extended. There are also occasional corner plots with detached houses that are set out in a similar arrangement to the appeal site.
4. The proposal would significantly alter the size of the property. Both proposed 2 storey side extensions would be flush to the main front elevation, project the full depth of the existing 2 storey side elevations and rise to the same height as the main roof ridge line. They would not appear as subservient additions and the width of the 2 storey part of the house would effectively double. The existing proportions would largely be lost to what would be an uncompromising design.
5. Due to the commanding position of the property at the crossroads, it would be apparent that the proposed 2 storey extensions would be excessive in their scale. With the angled form, these extensions would protrude forward of what are fairly well established building lines. It would be visually obtrusive in these

- surroundings and its discordant appearance would clearly be visible in a number of different directions. It would not be a comfortable feature in these surroundings, despite of the size of the plot.
6. There would be considerably less visibility of the proposed rear dormer, not least due to the screening afforded by the scale of the proposed 2 storey side extensions. Nevertheless, this would not be in itself insignificant in size, and would add to the overall extent of the harm that would arise to the building.
 7. The Council's Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (SPD) recognises that houses on corner plots can be more visible and sets out that it is important that the scale and design of extensions is sensitive to the original house and the area, as well as the need for such extensions to be proportionate. The SPD further advises that roof extensions should not occupy the full width, which is of relevance as regards the proposed rear dormer and the existing house. These matters do not favour the proposal. The SPD does accept that every property is different and this is part of the consideration of a scheme. However, in this case, the effect on the building and the area would be stark and would markedly detract from the local character.
 8. The appellant has referred me to a number of full depth 2 storey extensions in the area. From what I observed, these largely relate to the rows of semi-detached properties and are not on as prominent plots as the appeal site. They also extend the properties in such a way on one side only. I also observed a number of such extensions that were set back from the front elevation and set down from the main roof ridgeline in order to maintain a more subservient appearance. A detached property that had a full depth 2 storey extension was not on a corner plot or at a crossroads. They do not change my conclusion.
 9. I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the building and the area. Accordingly, it would not comply with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Council's Local Plan 2015-2030 (2015) (Local Plan) where they are concerned with development responding to its context, as well as meaningfully and sensitively to the site, its characteristics and constraints; and development proposals to complement the original building, harmonise with adjoining properties and maintain the character of the general streetscene, and be subordinate to the existing building, amongst other considerations.
 10. The proposal would also not accord with the SPD where it refers to the need to prevent an extension harming the character of the house and local area.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has referred to the exercising of permitted development rights as regards the proposed loft conversion and as a justification for a single storey rear extension which is also shown on the submitted plans. Even if I was to accept such a fallback position to justify these elements of the proposal, the extent of the proposed alterations are as such that I am not persuaded that they could be dealt with as severable elements in my decision.
12. The proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties due to the separation distances involved, and adequate levels of off-street car parking would be maintained.

Still, these matters would not address the harm to the character and appearance of the building and the area that would arise.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all matters that have been raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

Darren Hendley

INSPECTOR