



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2023

by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/22/3296914

18 Scott Gardens, Hounslow TW5 9JX

- 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 S Singh against the decision of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01500/18/P10, dated 3 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is described a '2 storey side, part single storey rear, part 1st floor rear extension.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a relatively modern two storey end terrace dwelling. There is a pleasant consistency to the terrace created by largely original and uniform buildings with lean to front porches arranged around a courtyard of sorts. These elements, along with the simplicity of the buildings, contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
4. Despite being of a relatively narrow profile when viewed from the front, the scheme as a whole would be substantial in its overall scale, the bulk of which would compete with the design and size of the existing building. There are extensions to the rear, which include a large flat roof dormer filling the roof plane. When viewed from the rear specifically, and taking into account these previous alterations, the modest scale of the original building would be all but lost. Largely taken over by substantial alterations which would employ awkwardly contrasting sizes, projections and roof designs. This would reduce the quality of the building and how it relates positively to the remainder of the terrace. The fact that these works would be mainly observed from the rear and thus not prominent in the public realm would not be sufficient to make them acceptable, particularly since they would be visible from a number of private gardens.
5. From the front, the extensions would appear subservient, being stepped down from the ridge and back from the front. Its narrow width would also allow appreciation of the dwelling's original design and form. This, in isolation, would not be a source of harm but, taken together, the bulk, mass and design

features of the extensions would, for the above reasons, cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.

6. As such, the proposed development would conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan: Volume One (2015-2030) and the guidance set out by the Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2017). Together, and amongst other things, these documents seek to ensure that new development responds to local architectural vernacular, conserves and takes opportunities to enhance features, supports high quality urban design, complements the original building and harmonises with adjoining properties.

Other Matters

7. Under Council reference 01500/18/P6, the appellant has received planning permission for the erection of a two storey side and single storey rear extension, in June 2021. The appellant claims that the appeal scheme is virtually identical to this, save for it including a first floor rear element. I have not seen a copy of the approved drawings for this planning permission. As such I cannot make a detailed comparison with the appeal scheme. Suffice as to say however that I have assessed it on its own merits and found harm in terms of its design, amount and scale which, as the appellant admits, is different from that which was approved in any event.
8. I have also seen in the appellant's evidence copies of plans from a number of other extension schemes granted planning permission by the Council. From the appellant's statement, it seems these have been advanced to illustrate the fact the Council has permitted developments which have used contrasting roof forms. I dare say there may be more examples than those presented. However, this does not mean I should allow the appeal since, even if the contrasting roof form was omitted, the development as a whole would still give rise to the harms I have explained.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons I have set out, the harm caused would lead to conflict with the development plan. There are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR