



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 January 2022

by Lewis Condé BSc (Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Wednesday 9 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/21/3284883

1 Ivanhoe Road, Hounslow, TW4 7JH

- 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 Balraj Bancil against the decision of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00642/1/P10, dated 3 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a loft extension to a dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the proposed loft extension to a dwellinghouse at 1 Ivanhoe Road, Hounslow, TW4 7JH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00642/1/P10, dated 3 June 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: 'Proposed Plans; Loft and Roof', 'Proposed Elevations', and 'Location and Block Plan', all stated to be received by the Council on 17 June 2021.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows shall be constructed on the gable end side elevation of the development hereby permitted.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council on its decision notice has described the development as the 'erection of a side extension to existing rear roof extension with one front window'. However, the description of development as stated on the application form is set out above and I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a dwellinghouse located at the end of a short terrace of properties on Ivanhoe Road. The street is largely formed of short blocks of terrace houses that share consistent features, such as, bay windows and hipped roofs. However, several of the end terraces within Ivanhoe Road have undertaken hip to gable alterations, including the appeal property. This has resulted in some of the terrace blocks not having a balanced form.
5. In addition to the existing hip to gable extension to its roof, the appeal property has also previously added a rear dormer, as well as a flat roof two-storey side extension. Due to these previous alterations, and because the other end terrace within this row has not been extended in a similar manner, the terrace that the appeal property is sited within already has an unbalanced appearance.
6. The proposed extension would involve the addition of a gable end roof over the existing flat roof to provide additional floorspace that would be linked to the existing loft conversion. The extension would include only a very minimal set down from the ridge height of the existing property. Additionally, the existing two-storey flat roof extension is already flush with the property's front elevation and, as such, the proposal's front roof slope does not contain a set-back. Consequently, the proposal would result in an increase in the overall massing of the host dwelling and the existing two-storey side extension would no longer appear subservient in character to the host dwelling.
7. Nevertheless, the proposals replicate the pitch of the existing roofline and visually it would result in a more pleasing development, that ties in more appropriately with the host building than the existing flat roof side extension. I also do not consider the proposal would further upset the rhythm of the terrace or the wider street, given the existing characteristics of the appeal property and the terrace block it is sited within. Consequently, I do not find the proposal to be harmful.
8. The LPA has also raised concern regarding the addition of a further roof light to the front roof plane of the extension. However, due to its overall scale and positioning in relation to existing rooflights, I do not find this minor addition to result in harm to the character of the property or wider area.
9. In forming my decision, I have had regard to the Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (SPD). I note that the proposals do not strictly accord with all relevant design principles, particularly those that seek for extensions to be clearly subordinate to the main house. Nevertheless, the SPD is guidance and specifically sets out that each property is slightly different and will be considered on its own merits. In this instance, due to the existing characteristics of the property and its wider context, I consider the proposals to be appropriate.
10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. Accordingly, I find the proposal would comply with the requirements of Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015 - 2030), which together seek to secure high quality design and support the extension of residential properties where these do not result in harm to the built environment. Although it would not follow certain guidelines

set out in the SPD, the proposal is not harmful due to its specific context. It would also not conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which seeks to secure high quality design which takes account of the local character and reflect the local surroundings.

Other Matters

11. I note that several neighbours objected to the application proposals on the ground of loss of light, loss of privacy and overbearing impacts, although I do not have details of which properties the objections related to. Despite the objections, the LPA did not refuse the application on grounds relating to impacts on the living conditions of neighbouring residents. I am also satisfied that the appeal scheme would not result in harmful impacts upon neighbouring residents, subject to a condition restricting further window openings in the new proposal. This is due to the overall limited additional massing that the development would add, alongside its relationship to neighbouring properties, and the location of existing and proposed windows in the extension.
12. The LPA's officer report indicates that the appeal proposal is almost identical in nature to two previously refused applications at this site. I do not have the details of those previous schemes before me. I also note a consent exists for a hipped roof extension on the existing two storey extension. However, given that I have concluded that the proposal before me would not result in harm I have not considered this matter further.

Conditions

13. A condition requiring matching materials is necessary in the interests of the appearance of the area. A condition restricting window openings in the new gable end, side elevation, of the proposed extension is also needed to protect the privacy of neighbours. Both parties were consulted on the imposition of this condition and no adverse comments were received.
14. Finally, a condition is also needed to secure compliance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. The relevant plans do not contain any drawing reference numbers, nor are they dated. Therefore, for clarity, I have included the date that they were stated to be received by the Council in the relevant condition.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework and all other relevant considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Lewis Condé

INSPECTOR