



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 July 2022 by S. Wilson LLB, MSc, LRTPI

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/22/3290173

45 Wood Lane, Isleworth, TW7 5EF

- 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 Prince Dooa against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01225/45/P4, dated 1 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension and first-floor side and rear 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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the wider area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Wood Lane is largely characterised by matching pairs of semi-detached two-storey properties of various designs. The northeast side of Wood Lane, of which the appeal site is part, comprises brick and pebble dash rendered houses originally with dual pitched, half hipped roofs. Some still present as original, whilst others have been extended and remodelled, including the appeal site.
5. Policy SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (adopted September 2015) (the Local Plan) supports the extension and improvement of residential properties subject to certain criteria, including that alterations and additions do not harm the existing character and appearance of the building and its context; and that development have regard to the design guidance set out in relevant Supplementary Planning Documents.
6. The thrust of the guidance in the Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (adopted December 2017) (Extension SPD) is that extensions should respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and be subservient to the original dwelling. It sets out that single storey rear extensions should be secondary to the original house in size, scale,

and mass and that first-floor rear extensions should be proportionate and subordinate to the dimensions of the main house. It also highlights that extra care needs to be taken on corner plots; and states that any wrap around proposal that connects a side extension to a rear extension on a corner plot will be refused.

7. The proposal would link the existing side and rear extensions together, and therefore would create a wrap-around extension. However, the ground floor element of this proposal would be well screened by boundary walls, would still allow the original building line to be read and would provide symmetry and balance to the host property. Therefore, although this element would not comply with the guidance in the Extension SPD, it would not be particularly visible or exposed and would be proportionate and secondary to the dwelling.
8. However, although the proposed first-floor extension would not project further than is recommended in the Extension SPD, it would be clearly visible in such a prominent location on a corner plot. In combination with the previous extensions and the ground floor wrap around now proposed, this would result in an overly dominant, inappropriately large, incongruous addition to the host dwelling, out of scale with the original dwelling.
9. Furthermore, the extension would overlap both the existing side extension and the original dwelling, and this, combined with the proposed hipped roof would relate poorly to the roof form of both the main house and the existing side extension. This would further add to the incongruity of the proposed design.
10. I note that the proposal was amended in response to comments from the Council during the application process. Nevertheless, for the reasons above even at the reduced scale, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the appeal property and the wider area.
11. Accordingly, it would fail to comply with Policies SC7, CC1 and CC2 of the Local Plan which require, amongst other things, that alterations and additions do not harm the existing character and appearance of a building and the general street scene and seek to support high quality design that conserves and enhances the character of the area.
12. Furthermore, it would conflict with elements of the guidance in the Extension SPD; and would not deliver the high-quality design required by the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

13. The Council has raised no issue with regard to the proposed hip to gable aspect of the scheme, and on the evidence before me I have no reason to disagree, given that such roof forms are common in the area. That does not however reduce the harm from the other parts of the proposal. Furthermore, the change to the roof is not clearly severable from the rest of the proposed development, and as such I cannot grant permission for that part in isolation.
14. There are other examples of large extensions in the local area, however I do not have any details of how those came to be built, and in particular whether they were considered under the same policies and guidance. Furthermore, I have not been directed to any that include the same combination of extensions as this proposal, and which are seen in a similar context. These do not therefore justify the harm that I have 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.

S Wilson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

L McKay

INSPECTOR