



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2021

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 November 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/21/3277981
305 Whitton Dene, Isleworth, TW7 7NE.

- 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 Mahan Mirza against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01203/305/P9, dated 04 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear and side extension, first floor side and rear extension and loft conversion with associated internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I understand from the evidence before me that the single storey rear extension and hip to gable and rear roof extension illustrated and described in the documents have previously been approved by reason of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). Nevertheless, as they are included on the original planning application, Council's decision notice and shown on the application drawings and not recorded on the as existing drawing, I shall, as the Council did when determining the original application assess these elements as part of the overall scheme design before me.

Main Issue

3. I consider the main issues to be:
 - a) the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host property, the terrace of which it is part and thereby the street scene; and,
 - b) the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of number 303 in terms of the proposals potential to appear overbearing and create an increased sense of enclosure.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, 305 Whitton Dene, is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling. It is located on a prominent corner plot. The terrace comprises a traditional parade of shops some of which, including number 305, have been converted into two-storey houses.

5. The appellant proposes a single storey side and rear extension, a first floor hipped roof extension, a hipped to gable loft conversion and rear dormer with three roof lights set in the roof slope facing Whitton Dene.

Character and appearance

6. The proposed ground floor rear extension would project some 3.05 metres further into the rear garden than the existing single storey rear extension. It would then link with the proposed side extension which in turn would be built right up to the street boundary. When the side and rear single storey extensions, which would extend from side boundary to side boundary, are taken together, they would appear as a substantive and dominant form of development despite their limited height.
7. The proposed first floor side and rear extension, like the single storey extension below, would wrap around the side and rear of the host property. Due to its plan shape and hipped roof configuration, it would appear as a visually bulky and intrusive addition.
8. The proposed hip to gable addition would add significantly to the overall bulk of the proposed development and would appear as an incongruous form of development. Furthermore, as the hip roof is retained at the far end of the terrace it would be detrimental to both the host property and the terrace of which it is part.
9. While the proposed dormer set in the enlarged roof may, as identified by the Council be an acceptable addition, it would only be achievable by reason of the hip to gable alteration to the roof, which I have found to be harmful. Accordingly, in the context of the hip to gable element of the project, the proposed dormer would add significantly to the overall bulk of the proposal as designed.
10. For the foregoing reasons I conclude in respect of the first main issue that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and wider street scene within Whitton Dene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of The London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (Adopted 15 September 2015) (LP), the London Borough of Hounslow Residential Extensions Guidelines (Adopted October 2003) (SPG) and National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) as they relate to, amongst other things, the quality of development and the need to complement the original building, harmonise with adjoining properties and maintain the character of the general street scene.

Living Conditions

11. The proposed single storey rear extension would replace the existing rear addition and in total would project some 6.0 metres into the rear garden from the original rear wall of the dwelling. The proposed extension would be nearly twice the recommended depth of single storey rear extensions set out in the SPG of 3.05 metres. As I saw there is no rear extension to the neighbouring dwelling number 303 Whitton Dean.
12. The proposed extension is shown to have a height of 3.0 metres, only about a metre taller than a typical residential garden boundary fence. Accordingly, I do not consider, given the built-up urban nature of the area and the depth of the rear garden of number 303 that the proposed single storey addition would

result in such an increased sense of enclosure to the occupiers of this property as to have an overbearing effect, resulting in harm to their living conditions.

13. I therefore conclude in respect of the second main issue that the proposed development would not result in harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of number 303 in the terms suggested by the Council. It would therefore accord with the objectives of LP Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7, the SPG and the Framework as they relate to, along with other things, the need to minimise harm to neighbouring residents.

Conclusions

14. In reaching my determination I have had regard to the need for affordable larger family homes and the improvement of the existing housing stock. I also accept that the proposal would enhance the living accommodation and the quality of life for the appellant and his family and note that there were no third-party objections to the proposal. However, none of these matters outweigh my findings on the main issues.
15. Having regard to all matters I have concluded that the proposal would not be prejudicial to residential living conditions. However, it would result in unacceptable harm to the architectural integrity of the host property, the terrace of which it is part and thereby the street scene. For that reason, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR