



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2023

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/23/3331641

55 Dawes Avenue, Isleworth, Hounslow, TW7 7JS

- 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 Michael Nazemi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00337/55/P1, dated 5 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 10 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as 'two and one storey side extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey, semi-detached dwelling which, along with other semi-detached and terraced dwellings, fronts onto a courtyard. It is sited perpendicular to the adjacent block of terraced houses, Nos 57-67 Dawes Avenue. It adjoins 53 Dawes Avenue on its western side and the main front elevations of the semi-detached pair are largely symmetrical in appearance.
4. Policies CC1 and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (2015) (LP) expect proposals (amongst other things) to respond to the context and character of the area in terms of design, whilst Policy SC7 requires residential alterations to complement the original building and harmonise with adjoining properties.
5. The Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (SPD) whilst non-statutory, provides useful design guidance. The SPD advises, amongst other things, that two storey side extensions should be secondary in appearance to the main house and their height and width should be proportionate to the dimensions of the main dwelling. The width of the extension should be significantly less than the width of the main house. It also advises that in most circumstances an extension should be set back at least 1 metre from the main front wall of the house to prevent a terracing effect and allow the original proportions of the building to remain the prominent feature.

6. The appeal site is unusual in that the main garden of the dwelling is to the side, with very limited space to the rear. I acknowledge that this arrangement prevents the possibility of rear extensions to the dwelling. However, the proposed extension is to the side of the host dwelling, is visible in the street scene and should therefore be assessed as a side extension.
7. The ridge height of the proposed extension would be slightly lower than that of the host dwelling. The flat roof single storey element would be slightly set back from the front bay whilst the two-storey extension would be set back further from the bay but would be flush with the main front wall of the host dwelling.
8. The proposed ground floor extension would have a width of 5.4m whilst the two-storey extension would have a width of about 4.5m. The host dwelling has a width of about 7.1m and the proposed extension would therefore be a sizable addition. Notwithstanding the slightly lower ridge height, the combination of the overall width of the two-storey extension and the lack of a set back from the main front wall of the dwelling would result it appearing overly dominant and out of proportion in relation to the host dwelling. I also consider that the large first floor window on the side elevation of the extension would fail to respect the design and proportions of other window openings and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
9. Given its lack of subservience, the extension would result in a significant unbalancing of the semi-detached pair which, in my view, would be harmful to their character and appearance. The extension would also be visible in the street scene, and I also find that in longer distance views across the adjacent courtyard, it would visually close the gap between Nos 55 and 57, having a negative effect on the spatial qualities of the area and disrupting the balance between the semi-detached pair and the row of terraces.
10. Thus, I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would conflict with the design objectives of Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the LP and the SPD.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has provided examples of other consented side extensions close to the appeal site. In respect of 60A Dawes Avenue, this application related to an end of terrace property and therefore the extension has less of an effect on the symmetry of the block. Moreover, the design of the extension with a significantly lower ridge height and set back from the front elevation ensures that it is subordinate in appearance to the dwelling that it adjoins and is less prominent in the street scene.
12. With regard to 4 Crane Avenue, whilst the extension under construction does not appear subordinate to the host dwelling, it does reflect an existing 2 storey side extension to 2 Crane Avenue which it adjoins and as such would create a more balanced elevation. Furthermore, Nos 2 & 4 have a different siting in relation to adjoining dwellings to that of the appeal property, with No 4 being bounded by Worple Avenue to the side. I therefore find that these examples are not directly relevant the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR