



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2021 by A Coombes

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/21/3281631

Site Address: 64 Northfield Road, Hounslow TW5 9JF

- 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 Nadarajah Varathanarajan against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow Council.
 - The application Ref 00814/64/P2, dated 11 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part single part two storey side extension to the house.
-

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. The description of the development at the application stage was "double storey side extension". However, the Council amended this description to "erection of a part single part two storey side extension to the house" and this description has since been used on the appeal form. Therefore, for the purposes of this appeal, the Council's description has been used.
4. On 20 July 2021 the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). I have had regard to this as a material consideration however, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site is a semi-detached two-storey dwelling constructed in brick. It is part of a standalone pair located within a residential context, surrounded by terraced houses and apartment blocks, also constructed in brick. There is an existing single-storey extension to the rear of the dwelling. The application seeks permission for a part single and part two-storey side extension.

7. The proposed extension would be constructed in matching materials, the ridge height would be lower than that of the host dwelling and the first-floor element would be set back from the existing front elevation. However, despite the incorporation of these subordinate design elements, the width of the proposed extension would be more than half of the main dwelling. Although the plot may be large enough to accommodate some form of extension, the appeal scheme would not be appropriate in relation to the size of the existing dwelling. The proposed development would appear bulky and, in terms of scale, would not be subordinate to the appeal property.
8. The ground floor element of the extension would be flush with the existing front elevation and therefore conflicts with the guidance within the London Borough of Hounslow Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), adopted 2017. On the site visit it was observed that two of the end terraces within the immediate context have been extended to the side. However, unlike the proposed development, the two examples are set back from the front elevation of the respective dwellings at both ground and first floor level. Therefore, in terms of design, the proposed development would not be consistent with the character and appearance of the area.
9. Due to the siting on the plot, the dwelling and proposed extension would be perpendicular to the nearby terraced properties. Therefore, in principle, a side extension would not create a terracing effect, which the SPD seeks to avoid. The proposed materials would match the existing dwelling, and, in this respect, it would not appear incongruous. Overall, these are neutral matters in the consideration of this appeal.
10. On balance of the reasons given above, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would not comply with Policies CC1 and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 – 2030, adopted 2015 (LP). Together these Policies require development to have due regard to its context and respond sensitively to its characteristics. The development would also fail to comply with Policy SC7 of the LP and the SPD, both of which require extensions to complement the original building in terms of character and mass.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

A Coombes

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR