

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2024

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/23/3332876
41 Harewood Road, Isleworth TW7 5HN

- 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 Mohamed Chaudry against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application, Ref. 00556/41/P6, dated 11 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 5 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion from hip to gable roof with rear dormer & roof lights to front sloping roof with main roof line up to the gable roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed alterations and additions on the character and appearance of the host property, the semi-detached pair with No. 43 Harewood Road and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that the appeal dwelling is positioned on the northern corner of the junction with Northumberland Avenue and forms one half of a semi-detached pair with No. 43. Nos. 41 & 43 as originally built were clearly a matching pair with a strong and attractive symmetry including front gables; bow windows at both first and ground floors; gabled porch entrances, and hipped roofs.
 4. This appearance has radically changed because of the two storey flat roofed extension to No. 43 which connects that house to No. 45; the different surface treatment to the front of No. 43, and the large two-storey side/rear extension to No. 41. Each of the additions to the two properties has in my view had a significantly adverse effect on the character and appearance of the original semi-detached building and the Harewood Road/Northumberland Avenue street scene. My reason for expressing this view in this appeal is solely because the design and scale of the alterations and additions already undertaken now materially inform the current proposal for a further extension.
 5. In the case of the appeal dwelling the shortcoming was because the side extension, by reason of its overall size and in particular its depth, was
-

insufficiently subservient to the original dwelling. This was however mitigated by the set down and set back of the extension relative to the main roof.

6. As regards the impact of the further extension, the hip to gable extension of the original main roof would result in a further loss of frontage symmetry of the original pair of Nos. 41 & 43. And as the officer's report points out, the addition would be particularly prominent and read awkwardly with the retained hipped roof of the previous extension in views from both Harewood Road at the front and Northumberland Avenue at the rear.
7. In respect of the rear dormer, in addition to the above-mentioned conflict of roof forms, this extension would appear disproportionately large given its proximity to the roof ridge, eaves and sides - contrary to the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines. This would compound the somewhat bulky and incongruous nature of the appeal scheme and draw the eye in the wide range of views available at and close to the junction of Harewood Road and Northumberland Avenue. However, in the case of the latter, I accept that the roof of the existing side/rear extension would in part obscure the proposed roof additions and alterations.
8. I have carefully considered the grounds of appeal which are both thorough and clear in setting out the appellant's case. Accordingly, I acknowledge that the extension would provide much needed family living space; that no neighbour objections were forthcoming; that no harm would be caused to the living conditions of neighbours, and in particular that the character and appearance of the area has been affected by extensions to other houses, many in a form similar to the appeal scheme.
9. Nonetheless, after careful inspection at my visit of most of these examples, I am of the view that for the most part they only serve as a reminder of the harm that can be caused to the character and appearance of the area by inappropriately large and unsympathetically designed extensions. Essentially, I regard them as a harmful precedent that should not be followed. This is because the proposals would not have sufficient regard to Policies CC1, CC2 & SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030; the Residential Extension Guidelines SPD, and Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed and Beautiful Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023.
10. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR