
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 June 2024

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/24/3343060

21 Northumberland Avenue, Isleworth TW7 5HZ

- 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 Imran Shaikh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00819/21/P3, dated 28 January 2024, was refused by notice dated 12 March 2024.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey side, rear and front extension incorporating a porch to dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey side, rear and front extension incorporating a porch to dwellinghouse at 21 Northumberland Avenue, Isleworth TW7 5HZ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 00819/21/P3, dated 28 January 2024, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Refs 07/20, 08/20 and 09/20.
 - 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 on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached house within a mainly residential area wherein dwellings are similar in age and style with some variety in size and general appearance partly due to various extensions and alterations that have been carried out. There is, therefore, variety to the built form in the street scene and the local area to which No 21 belongs.
4. The proposal is primarily to enlarge the appeal dwelling with a ground floor extension that would wrap around the front, side and rear of the main house. A conservatory and utility room to the rear of the host building, which are not

- shown on the plans, would be demolished and removed to make way for the new addition, as would be the existing garage at the side of the house.
5. A significantly larger building would result with extended front and rear elevations across almost the full width of the plot. The new side addition would step forward of the existing main front wall with a mono-pitched roof that would continue across the front elevation to connect with a new porch. This arrangement would conflict with some of the advice within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, *Residential Extension Guidelines* (SPD).
 6. Nevertheless, the proposal has been designed to complement the form, scale, and design of the existing house. It would be a proportionate addition to the host building with a roof form and external materials that would reflect the style of the existing house and unify the overall design. The new addition would project no further forward than the existing front porch with a gap retained between the completed dwelling and the road to ensure that a sense of space is maintained in the local street scene. In other words, no significant disharmony would result from the proposed arrangement.
 7. I saw that several other properties along Northumberland Avenue have been enlarged in ways that are similar to the proposal with side extensions that step forward of the main front wall and connect with a front porch. As such, the proposed extension would not be an uncharacteristic addition nor introduce an obtrusive feature within the street scene or the local area. The Council raises no objection to other elements of the appeal scheme including the new rear extension or the new entrance and windows in the front elevation. From the plans, I, too, find these aspects of the proposed development acceptable.
 8. Taken overall, the house, once enlarged, would be significantly changed on all 3 sides. Although a sizeable addition, the proposed extension would not appear overly large, bulky or incongruous. By complementing the intrinsic character of the host building and respecting the character and qualities of the local area, the proposal would adhere to the key principles of the SPD. Therefore, a conflict with some of the advice within the SPD is insufficient reason in itself to withhold planning permission.
 9. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would not cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the local area. As such, it does not conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Council's Local Plan 2015-2030, which aim to ensure that development maintains or enhances the character of the area.
 10. In addition to the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to impose a condition that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development, a condition is imposed to require that the external materials match those of the existing building.
 11. Overall, there are no material considerations that indicate the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons set out above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR