



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 July 2022

by L J O'Brien BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/22/3290388

2 Dawes Avenue, ISLEWORTH, TW7 7JT

- 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 Stan Rosol against the decision of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00337/2/P6, dated 29 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of a hip to gable and rear roof extension with two juliet balconies and three front roof windows, erection of a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area; and
 - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 2 Dawes Avenue, is a two-storey semi-detached property which occupies a corner plot at the junction of Dawes Avenue and Twickenham Road. The proposal is for a single storey rear extension and a hip to gable and rear roof extension with two Juliette balconies and three front roof windows.

Character and appearance

4. Dawes Avenue and the surrounding area is characterised by residential properties which line the roads and are set back behind small front garden areas. Though there is a variety of building types in design terms, dwellings have notable similarities and are largely within small terraces or semi-detached pairs with pitched roofs.
5. The proposed rear roof extension would be set-in fractionally from the edges of the roof, set-up marginally and would not be set down from the ridge. The roof extension would cover almost the entire rear roof slope of the property and, in my view, would fail to respect the scale or proportions of the existing dwelling at No 2. I consider that, due to its size and the percentage of the roof slope it

- would cover, the roof extension would appear as a bulky, visually dominant and unsympathetic addition which would not be subservient to the host property.
6. Furthermore, the appeal property forms part of a broadly symmetrical semi-detached pair of dwellings. Though the pair do have differences in their appearance the fundamental design, proportions and roof profiles are such that a sense of cohesion is created. The hip to gable conversion would unbalance the appearance of the semi-detached pair as the neighbouring property would retain the hipped roof form. This imbalance would harmfully erode the symmetry which currently exists and would cause harm to the character and appearance of the pair of dwellings and the wider area.
 7. The proposed single storey rear extension would also be an extremely large addition. The proposal would span much of the width of the rear elevation of the dwelling and would be approximately 6.478 metres deep projecting a substantial distance from the rear elevation. The resultant structure would appear as a visually obtrusive and disproportionately large addition which would fail to complement the host dwelling.
 8. Individually, each element of the proposal would appear unduly large and would fail to assimilate well with the host dwelling. Cumulatively, the proposed extensions would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of 2 Dawes Avenue.
 9. I note the appellant's view that the single storey extension would be of a higher design quality than the existing extension it would replace and acknowledge that some aspects of the proposal have been designed in such a way so as to complement the host dwelling and surrounding area. I also recognise that there are other extensions and alterations in the area which, particularly from the rear, create a varied character and appearance. However, these considerations would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified above.
 10. For the reasons set out above I consider that the proposal would cause substantial harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area. Consequently, the proposal would fail to accord with Policies CC1 and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (LP). Amongst other things these policies seek to promote a high quality urban design and ensure that all new development conserves and takes opportunities to enhance the borough's places. The proposal would also fail to meet the expectations set out by Policy SC7 of the LP which supports the extension of residential properties provided they maintain the character of the area.
 11. The proposal would also conflict with guidance contained within the London Borough of Hounslow's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPG), adopted December 2017 which states that permission will normally be refused for hip to gable conversions and holds that single storey rear extensions should project only 3.65m from the main rear wall of semi-detached houses.
 12. The development would also fall short of the expectations of The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) which promotes high standards of design and states that developments should be visually attractive and sympathetic to the character of the area.

Living conditions

13. Due to the corner location of No 2 Dawes Avenue, the neighbouring dwelling which fronts Twickenham Road (No 290 Twickenham Road) sits at an angle looking over the rear of No 2. The neighbouring property would, therefore, look directly onto the proposed rear extension from its rear garden area and rear windows at close proximity. In my view, due to the layout of the buildings on site and the excessive depth of the single storey rear projection it would appear as a visually dominant feature when viewed from the rear of No 290 and would lead to a harmful and oppressive sense of enclosure.
14. The proposed rear extension would also be in close proximity to the neighbouring dwelling at No 4 Dawes Avenue. Due to the angles and relative positions of buildings around the site I consider that any impact on this property would be less notable than that which I have identified at 290 Twickenham Road. However, in my view, the depth of the proposed rear projection is, nevertheless, such that it would have the effect of harmfully enclosing the rear of No 4 along one side.
15. I note that the proposed rear extension would be single storey in nature, however, for the reasons set out above, I do not consider that this would be sufficient to mitigate the harm to outlook I have identified above.
16. The proposed single storey rear extension, due to its depth, would be likely to have some effect on the levels of light reaching neighbouring properties at certain, limited, points in the day. However, due to the single-storey nature of this element of the proposal any such effect would be minimal and would not be so marked so as to cause an unacceptable degree of harm to the living conditions at neighbouring properties in this regard.
17. I acknowledge the concerns expressed by the Council in respect of the potential harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents which would be caused by the roof extension. However, in my view, due to the position of the roof extension in relation to neighbouring dwellings, I consider that this element of the scheme would not in itself cause harm in this respect.
18. For the reasons detailed above, I consider that the proposal would cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties with particular regard to outlook. As such, the proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policy CC2 of the LP which, amongst other things sets out the Council's aim to retain, promote and support high quality urban design to create attractive, distinctive and liveable places which have a positive impact on the amenity of current and future residents. The proposal would also fail to comply with Policy SC7 of the LP which states that the Council will support the extension and improvement of residential properties provided that they do not result in harm to the amenity of neighbouring residents.
19. The proposal would also be at odds with the aims of the SPG which sets the Council's guidelines for residential extensions in order to prevent unacceptable harm to neighbouring residents. There would also be a failure to conform with The Framework which states that developments should create a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Other Matters

20. I have noted a number of other issues raised; however, as this proposal is going to be dismissed for other reasons and the other concerns expressed do not have a direct bearing on the main issues, it is not necessary for these to be explored further as part of this appeal.
21. I understand that the proposal would improve the living space and living conditions for the occupiers of the appeal property and acknowledge the appellant's view that the proposal would represent sustainable development. However, these considerations are not sufficient to dissuade me from the conclusions I have reached that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

22. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should fail.

L J O'Brien
INSPECTOR