
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2021

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/21/3274020

13 Bracken End, Isleworth TW7 7PW

- 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 Satinder Williams against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01475/13/P2, dated 13 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a double storey side extension at 13 Bracken End, Isleworth TW7 7PW in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 01475/13/P2, dated 13 March 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Refs E101 and E102.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

3. The proposal is a two-storey extension at the side of the appeal property, which is a two-storey end-terrace dwelling within a modern estate style residential area. It occupies a corner plot at the junction of Bracken End and Harvester Close. The main front wall of No 13 stands noticeably forward of the other dwellings in the same terrace, which follow a common front build line. This stepped arrangement is a distinctive feature of the terrace.
4. An identical extension to that proposed was granted planning permission on appeal in 2011. As the approved scheme was not implemented, that planning permission has now lapsed. Since that time, planning policy at all levels has been updated. The National Design Code has also recently been introduced.

5. The proposed side extension would be more than one half the width of the existing dwelling and it would not be set back from the principal elevation. As such, the appeal scheme conflicts with some of the advice in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, *Residential Extension Guidelines* (REG).
6. Nevertheless, in this instance, a set back from the main front wall by at least one metre to comply with the REG would unduly disrupt the layout and design of the terrace. It would draw the eye from the road because the host dwelling would appear unbalanced and it would relate awkwardly to the rest of the terrace. In contrast, the proposal continues the same front building line of the existing dwelling and so it maintains the current and planned appearance of the terrace. On this particular occasion, the submitted design is preferable to a development that complies with the guidance in the REG.
7. Furthermore, although wider than one half of the existing dwelling, the extension would not be overly large or bulky. I agree that the proportions of the original dwelling would be less evident with the new built form in place. However, no visual disharmony would result as the extension would blend in with the style of the host dwelling and matching external materials would be used. Sufficient space would also be retained between the flank wall of the completed dwelling and the adjacent footway along Harvester Close. As such, the finished building would stand comfortably within the corner plot and maintain a sense of space in the local street scene of which it forms part.
8. For all of these reasons, the proposal positively responds to the characteristics of the appeal dwelling and its particular context, which is an approach that Policies CC1 and CC2 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (LP) generally support. LP Policy SC7 also notes that proposals should have regard to the design guidelines in the Supplementary Planning Documents rather than require strict compliance in each case. Consequently, at least some flexibility can be applied when assessing development proposals to reflect local circumstances, which in my experience often vary from site to site. Against that background, I find that a conflict with some aspects of the REG is insufficient reason in itself to withhold planning permission.
9. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the local area. Accordingly, it would not conflict with LP Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7. These policies aim to ensure that new development complements the original building, harmonises with adjoining properties and maintains the character of the street scene. It would achieve the high standard of design sought by national planning policy and the National Design Code.
10. In addition to the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to impose a condition that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the extension, a condition is imposed to require that the external materials match those of the existing building.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR