



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 April 2023

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/22/3313579

56 Broad Walk, Hounslow, TW5 9AB

- 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 Jagjeet Singh Corana against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00162/56/P2, dated 27 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is conversion of garage into habitable room, erection of first floor side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. I consider that the main issues in this case are its effect on the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Reasons

3. 56 Broad Walk is a two storey semi detached house in an extensive and well established residential area. There is a clear pattern of development of mainly semi detached houses with original common architectural features including hipped roofs, two storey gabled bay windows to the front and a small oriole window to the front at first floor level. Many of the houses have been altered and extended in a variety of ways such that their original form has been lost, for example, several show evidence of having had a catslide roof to the side, some of those remaining have a dormer in that roof, similar to Nos. 54 and 56. Many have replaced the hipped roof with a gable. Most seem to have retained the small first floor oriole window which is seen not only in Broad Walk but also in many houses in the wider area of the estate.
4. The main policies relevant in this case include CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (the local plan) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extension Guidelines 2017 (the SPD). Policies CC1 and CC2 relate, among other things, to design matters and seek to enhance the quality of areas and to protect the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties from any adverse effects of new development. Policy SC7 focuses on residential extensions in general terms regarding their design and impact on neighbouring residents and the SPD sets out more detailed guidance in respect of size and scale.

5. Extensive works were under way at the time of my visit, with the interior gutted and exposed block work. The plans of the existing submitted with the application show the existing rear dormer and the ground floor extension, but no first floor extension. However, there is a first floor rear extension under construction which appears to correspond to the plans of the proposed development submitted with the application. The first floor oriole window appears to have been removed.
6. I consider that in terms of character and appearance, the proposed rear first floor element would be acceptable as it would remain subservient to the main house and is not visible from the street. The side extension would increase the height of the side wall close to the boundary with No. 58 to the height of the main eaves and introduce a hipped roof to meet the gable. I consider that this would result in a bulky and incongruous element which would add to the already marked asymmetry of the pair of semi detached houses. It would also have a cramped appearance, emphasised by its close proximity to and angled juxtaposition with No. 58. The removal of the oriole window further detracts from the character and appearance of the house.
7. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the existing house and the wider street scene, contrary to local plan policies CC1, CC2 and SC7.
8. The relationship between Nos. 56 and 58, with No.58 set at an angle, means that No. 58 has a cramped rear garden and rear windows in very close proximity to the boundary with No. 56. The proposed side extension would run the full length of the side elevation of No. 56 and, because of its height and proximity to the boundary would result in a loss of outlook, increasing the sense of enclosure and appearing overbearing.
9. I conclude that the proposal would harm the living conditions of neighbouring residents, contrary to local plan policies CC2 and SC7 and the SPD.
10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR