



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 May 2024

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/24/3341720

21 Thornbury Avenue, Isleworth, Hounslow, TW7 4NF

- 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 Prashant Taware against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01118/21/P4, dated 13 November 2023, was refused by notice dated 19 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is described as 'existing canopy of PVC to the rear of the house'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The canopy has already been erected and the proposal is therefore for its retention.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, including on the Spring Grove Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey, semi-detached dwelling with an original two storey outrigger. It has been extended at the rear through a series of single storey extensions. The dwelling is located in a road comprising of similar dwellings. It is within the Spring Grove Conservation Area (CA).
5. The CA is extensive, comprising for the most part a mid-to-late Victorian residential estate, along with early-to-mid twentieth century housing and civic development. The Council's Conservation Area Appraisal (2019) (CAA) identifies that the area's special architectural and historic interest derives from an estate planned to be a grand Victorian suburb. The CAA confirms that the CA comprises tall classic style villas in spacious gardens, the mansion of Campion House, gothic structure of Lancaster House and more subtle Arts and Crafts styled semi-detached properties, which along with others amalgamate into the whole. The appeal property forms one of a number of dwellings that

are more modest in their scale and appearance, but which as a whole, contribute to the significance of the CA.

6. The statutory duty in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) is of considerable importance and weight. Paragraph 203 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (the Framework) states, amongst other things, that the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness should be taken into account in determining applications. Paragraph 205 of the Framework also advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to their conservation irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to their significance. Paragraph 208 requires that, where a proposal would lead to 'less than substantial harm,' the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme.
7. The canopy has a depth of 3m and is supported by timber posts. It is open on three sides, with a polycarbonate roof. It has a height of around 2.6m where it adjoins the rear wall of the existing extension, with the shallow mono-pitch roof sloping down to around 2.4m.
8. The original dwelling has already been extended to the rear at single storey level. The canopy is attached to the previous extensions and together with these extensions, projects beyond the original main wall of the dwelling by about 11.24m and beyond the outrigger by approximately 9.27m. This depth would be significantly in excess of the Council's guidance for single storey extensions as set out in their Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (SPD). In respect of semi-detached dwellings, the SPD states that rear extensions should be secondary to the original house and should not exceed a depth of 3.65m.
9. The canopy adds to the depth of the existing rear extensions which, in combination, overwhelm and dominate the rear elevation of the dwelling. The canopy is not well integrated with the design of the previous extensions and appears as a poor quality, incongruous addition to the dwelling which is harmful to its character and appearance.
10. Views of the canopy extension are limited to those obtainable from nearby dwellings. Nonetheless, it is higher than the boundary enclosures on either side and due to the extent of projection beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling, it appears unduly prominent within its garden setting. Whilst the neighbouring dwellings have also been extended, with the adjoining semi also having a rear canopy, it is the overall depth of projection beyond the original walls of the dwelling together with the height and design of the canopy that contributes to its dominance.
11. Therefore, for the above reasons, I find that the development has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. Accordingly, the proposal would not preserve or enhance the significance of the CA and would result in "less than substantial" harm in the words of the National Planning Policy Framework. No public benefits have been put forward to weigh against this harm.

12. Hence, the appeal proposal would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and the design and heritage aims of CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030. It would also be contrary to the design objectives of the SPD.

Other Issues

13. I acknowledge that the canopy provides useful space for the purpose of drying clothes but this consideration does not outweigh the harm that I have identified above.

Conclusion

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

J Davis

INSPECTOR