



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 September 2021 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc MSc MIEMA CEnv MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/21/3276219

118 Woodland Gardens, Isleworth TW7 6LP

- 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 Darbon on behalf of SL Property Ltd against the decision of the Council of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01228/118/P5, dated 19 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. A certificate of lawfulness for hip to gable and rear roof extension with Juliet balcony and three front roof windows was approved on 8 April 2021¹. That scheme has now been constructed. As observed on my visit to the site, the existing situation is therefore different to what is reflected in the 'existing' drawings² received by the Council on 22 March 2021.
4. The proposed drawings in relation to the appeal scheme depict the two-storey side extension would tie in with the original hipped roof of the property. That would no longer be possible because the hipped roof no longer exists, and the dormer window has been erected across the rear. The only way to construct the proposed scheme in accordance with the submitted drawings would be to remove the hip to gable conversion and rear dormer, such that a hipped roof could be erected as shown on the approved plans, which would tie in with the proposed extension.
5. In light of the changed circumstances arising from the recent construction works, the appellant was contacted to ask if he still wished to proceed with the appeal scheme. However, the appellant has indicated that he wishes for the

¹ 01228/118/LAW1

² Drawing nos. 01 and 02

appeal to be determined on the basis of the submitted appeal documents. I will proceed accordingly and have considered the appeal on the basis that what would be constructed, if the proposal was approved, would be the two-storey side extension, which would tie in with the original dwelling with a hipped roof, as shown on the proposed plans.

Main Issue

6. The effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host property and street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. No. 118 is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on a corner plot on Woodland Gardens. It is symmetrically paired with No.116. The property benefits from a single storey side extension and a single storey rear extension³. The surrounding area is residential, and the distinctive character is derived from predominantly hipped roof two-storey symmetrically paired semi-detached dwellings. Whilst Woodland Gardens is a long radial street with some existence of roof extensions and alterations along its length, there is uniformity on the street. A larger percentage of properties still retain their original hipped roof. These prominent features create the appearance of a neat and unified street scene.
8. The semi-detached properties are generally set close together resulting in a tightly packed arrangement. However, it is notable that the original layout was such that properties at road junctions were generally set back from the edge of the pavement with gardens to the side. That is the case with the appeal property, the property on the opposite side of the junction and the corresponding semi-detached houses at the other end of the link to Riverside Walk. In an otherwise densely packed area, those deliberately planned gaps add welcome relief and a sense of spaciousness which adds to the character of the area.
9. That sense of openness has been diminished to a degree as a result of the single storey side extension which runs up to the edge of the garden and a similar extension to the side of the property on the opposite side of the junction. However, those extensions are subservient in scale and do not reduce the gap between the two storey flank walls to a significant degree, particularly at first floor level. The proposed double storey side extension would not be set in from the side boundary of the property and neither would the ground floor front wall be set back from the wall of the host property, in a similar fashion as the existing single storey side extension. This is contrary to guidance within the Council's Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (the SPD) which states that a side extension on a corner plot with a road which is visible from the public highway should be set in at least one metre in from the side boundary and at least one metre back from the main front wall of the house. This is regardless of whether there is an existing ground floor extension.
10. As a result, the proposal would appear as a bulky addition to the host property and would not appear subordinate in scale. It would also significantly unbalance the symmetry with its pair. The contribution that the host property

³ 01228/118/P4

and adjoining dwelling make to the appearance of the street scene would be diminished as a result. The scale and design of the resulting development would be more visible at this corner plot than that of the other paired dwellings in its immediate vicinity of Woodland Gardens. The large two-storey flank wall directly abutting the pavement would be particularly unsympathetic in the context of the layout of the area and would tower above the pavement and significantly reduce the gap between properties across the junction.

11. The appellant has presented photographs of two storey extensions at No. 60 Woodlands Road and 72 Woodland Gardens where the extensions are not set back from the front nor set down from the main roof ridge. Neither party has provided specific information relating to the background to those examples, including whether they have planning permission or when they were constructed. They possibly could have had different elements constructed over time, enabled by permitted development rights and as such were not subject to the assessment of a formal planning application. As observed on visit to the site, 60 Woodlands Road appears to be of some vintage and would have been completed prior to the adoption of the SPG and London Borough of Hounslow's Local Plan 2015-2030 (2015) (the 'LP') and therefore would have been subject to different planning considerations. In any event, those examples also result in a hard, two storey, gable directly adjacent to the footpath and are not particularly sympathetic when contrasted with properties which retain a degree of openness to the site.
12. The single storey side extension at no. 120 Woodland Gardens is not directly comparable on account of its much smaller scale. Nevertheless, each appeal must be determined according to its own merits. Consequently, the other examples referred to do not amount to a justification for the harm that would arise from the proposal in this instance.
13. I find that the development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. Accordingly, it would fail to conserve or enhance the character of the CA and conflicts with the aims and objectives of policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the LP and the National Planning Policy Framework which seek amongst other things to ensure that all new development conserves and takes opportunities to enhance the character and quality of distinctive areas of the borough.
14. The appellant contends that the proposal is needed to secure additional living space, although the weight I attach to this is limited in the absence of any details of the precise needs of the occupants. In any event, I am not satisfied that the proposal represents the only means to secure additional space, particularly as an alternative form of extension has already been constructed. Consequently, this does not outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR.