

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2024

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/23/3333882
391-393 Hanworth Road, Hounslow TW4 5LF

- 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 Baldev Phull & Ms Naveen Sikka against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow Council.
 - The application Ref 00553/391-393/P2, dated 26 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 5 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is for part double storey side extensions and a part single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') was published in December 2023, but there are no material changes relevant to the substance of the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises two adjacent semi-detached houses within a busy mixed residential and commercial area where there is a range of architectural designs and forms. Nos 391 and 393 whilst not semi-detached to each other are linked by virtue of their garages at ground floor level, the flat roofs of which are concealed behind a parapet wall. Consequently, there is a gap at first floor level providing a view through to St. Heliers Avenue behind from the opposite side of Hanworth Road.
5. Whilst I noticed on my site visit that architecture is varied, on the whole buildings tend to be separated at least at first floor level within the immediate locality and this provides the prevailing pattern of development of the area.
6. In isolation, I consider that the extensions would appear subordinate by virtue of the set down of their ridgelines and set back of their front elevations at first floor level, particularly bearing in mind that the ground floor front elevations as

proposed, would be in a very similar alignment to those of the aforementioned garages. However, the extensions to no's 391 and 393 cannot be viewed in isolation and whilst the main roof forms would be hipped, nonetheless the existing spaciousness provided between the two would be significantly eroded.

7. I note that the proposal is to extend the dwellings to provide accommodation for the larger extended family living as one household in both properties, although with respect, that would ultimately give rise to the form following its function. I did note that there are single detached properties that have been constructed in recent times due northeast of the appeal site, however whilst slight there remains a small degree of separation between them and the adjacent properties. I also acknowledge that the properties are not in a Conservation Area and are not locally listed, however, compliance with the Council's Design Guidelines is only one material consideration in the overall planning balance.
8. Whilst I am aware that this form of proposal can be seen elsewhere within the Borough, each case must be assessed on its own merits. I do however have little concern with regard to the single storey rear extension to no 393 due its position out of public view. Nonetheless the two storey side extensions would result in an incongruous form of development that would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Hanworth Road street scene with the current visual gap at first floor level effectively proposed to be infilled.
9. In coming to this conclusion I have had regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) set out under S.149 of the Equality Act 2010, but the risks caused by the proposed extensions upon the character and appearance of the area outweigh its benefits in terms of eliminating discrimination against persons with the protected characteristics of age, race, religion or belief, advancing equality of opportunity for those persons and fostering good relations between them and others. I conclude that it is proportionate and necessary to dismiss the appeal with the scheme causing demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the area and contrary to Policies CC1 and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 – 2030 which seek to retain, promote and support high quality urban design and architecture to create attractive, distinctive and liveable places and seeking to raise design standards and to ensure that all new development conserves and takes opportunities to enhance their special qualities by, amongst other things, improving and promoting the appreciation of the character and qualities of the distinctive areas of the Borough, by securing development that sensitively and creatively responds to an area's character and by refusing poor quality design.

Conclusion

10. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised by the appellant, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR