



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2023

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22.12.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/23/3326428

38 Epworth Road, Isleworth, London, TW7 5BN

- 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 Campbell against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00414/38/P2, dated 30 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is demolition of garage and the erection of a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of garage and the erection of a single storey side extension at 38 Epworth Road, Isleworth, London, TW7 5BN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00414/38/P2, dated 30 March 2023, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan; Proposed Roof Plan; Proposed Ground Floor Plan; Proposed Front – South Elevation; Proposed Rear – North Elevation; Proposed Side – East Elevation; Proposed Side – West Elevation; Proposed Side East Elevation with Wall in Front of Proposed Extension and Proposed Site Plan (PSP01).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a 2 storey end of terraced house on the corner of a junction. The terrace shares the same design as the terrace on the other side of the road. End properties have 2 storey bays with hipped roofs projecting at the front of the house. Mid terraced houses have flat roofed 2 storey bays with

hanging tiles between the first and second floors. Ornamental lintels above the front doors also contribute to their character. Where the end properties are located on the junction, the main houses are set in from the side boundary. However, on the appeal site an attached garage on the side of the house extends out to the boundary edge. The garage has a single pitched roof and is clad in bituminous roof felt.

4. The proposed development would replace the existing garage with a single storey brick side extension. Instead of a single pitched roof it would have a half hipped roof more in keeping with the main house. According to the Council, the proposed extension would be 54% of the width of the main house. In my view that accords with the Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (SPD) which advises that single storey side extensions should be substantially less than the width of the main house, notwithstanding that for more visually dominant, 2 storey side extensions, a 50% maximum width guideline is given. Also, the width would be the same as the existing garage and its impact on the street scene would be no different in this regard.
5. The SPD states that it may be necessary for side extensions to be set back behind the main building line to prevent a terracing effect. However, the house is at the end of a terrace and separated from the nearest house by a road so there is no potential for a terracing affect. Furthermore, the SPD notes that a setback may not be required where an existing garage which already projects up to the front line of the house is to be replaced, which is the case with the appeal proposal. I note that the SPD advises that a set in from the boundary may be necessary on corner plots to reduce the impact of an extension. However, given that the existing garage already abuts the boundary edge I do not consider that to be necessary.
6. The roof would be higher than that of the existing garage, but the extension would remain subservient to the host property and would not be significantly larger than the garage it would replace. The materials would reflect that of the main house, and it would be a more appropriate and better designed addition than the existing garage. I consider that the proposed development would therefore accord with Policies SC7, CC1 and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (2015) and the SPD which support high quality design that has regard to the quality, character, materials, and scale of the existing building.

Conditions

7. In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission I have specified the approved plans to provide certainty and imposed a condition regarding materials to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR