



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2023

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 14th February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/22/3310968

26 Wellington Avenue, Hounslow TW3 3SX

- 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 Ms R Maisuria against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01178/26/P1, dated 23 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the individual dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this 2-storey semi detached house which is set within this residential area. The road contains a variety of house styles, mainly of 2 storeys in height. The appeal dwelling is one of a number of semi-detached houses, said to date from the immediate post-war era, of a very similar design. There are also earlier terraced houses, perhaps dating from the Edwardian era. These are constructed with shallow front gardens.
4. The appeal property has a main 2 storey element and a secondary element which is set back from the front and this is replicated in many other houses on the road. No 26 and its attached neighbour at No 24 are set adjacent to a terrace of earlier houses, with No 24 being next to these. No 24 has been extended with a 2 storey side extension whereby the extension has brought the previously set-back side section forward in line with the original front element. Although there are some differences, the appeal scheme seeks to replicate the arrangement at No 24.
5. The Council states within its 'Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document' of 2017 (SPD) that, normally, a 2 storey side extension should be no wider than half the width of the original house and should be set back by a minimum of 1 metre from the main front wall. The proposal would comply with neither of these guides. The SPD also states that "*The only*

exception may be in the case of end of terrace or semi-detached houses, where there is an existing two - storey side extension without a set-back on the other end of terrace/adjoining house, the Council may grant planning permission for a matching extension without a set-back. In cases such as this, the Council will expect to see that the symmetry of a pair of semis or the opposite ends of a terrace is kept or restored."

6. The extension to No 24 was granted in 1986 and pre-dates the Council's Policies and SPD by some considerable margin. The neighbouring property to No 24 at No 22 is part of the earlier terrace of houses which are set considerably forward of the later semi-detached houses. In my assessment of the situation, prior to the extension at No 24, the side wall of the house at No 22 would have had a considerable effect in the street-scene and its position would have been obvious and quite different to the effect of the semi-detached houses. Whilst no documents have been submitted in regard to this, I can see that the extension at No 24 would have had the effect of partly screening the side wall of No 22 and rather acted as a foil to No 22, softening its effect on the street-scene and going some way to justify the size and positioning of the extension at No 24.
7. Whilst I accept that the proposal would have some re-balancing effect between Nos 24 and 26, I consider that it would have an unacceptable appearance in many other respects. Its size, width and forward positioning would mean that it would dominate the existing house and, when seen in the wider street-scene, it would appear as an overbearing addition. It would lack any of the justifying or positive aspects of the extension at No 24, which I have set out above. In my view, the unacceptable effects of the extension would not be outweighed by any benefits in relation to balancing with No 24.
8. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would raise conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Local Plan 2015-2030 and the SPD. I find that there are no matters sufficient to outweigh that conflict and so the appeal is dismissed.

T Wood

INSPECTOR