



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 August 2024

by Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/24/3341605

101 Thorncliffe Road, Southall, Hounslow UB2 5RN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Birk against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is 01120/101/P4.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension at 101 Thorncliffe Road, Southall, Hounslow UB2 5RN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 01120/101/P4, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PA-01 (Rev A).

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property (No 101) has a single-storey rear extension and a two-storey side extension. In October 2023, the Council confirmed that 'Prior Approval' was not required for a 6m deep rear 'larger home extension' which would not extend across the entire width of the host property (reference 01120/101/PA1). Although this development has not been constructed, the appeal evidence indicates that it represents a credible fall-back position and it is therefore material to this appeal decision.
4. The appeal proposal seeks consent for a full width extension which would be significantly deeper than extensions normally allowed by the Council's Supplementary Planning Document *Residential Extension Guidelines* (SPD).

However, the depth of the proposed extension would be the same as that shown in the prior approval scheme.

5. The neighbouring property at No 103 is a house which appears to be in use as an office for an infant and nursery school. Educational buildings at the rear of No 103 can be seen from the roadside. No 103 is set in considerably from the boundary with No 101 and stands on a spacious, open plot. The end of the proposed extension would be partly visible from the street through the gap between the host property and No 103. However, No 103 has a shed along part of the boundary fence. Its gable end broadly aligns with the rear elevation of the taller, existing extension at the rear of the appeal property. In combination, these structures screen most views of the area beyond the rear of No 101.
6. Although the proposed extension would be deeper than the existing extension, its appearance from the street would be little different and would not appear out of place. Furthermore, the visual impact of the prior approval extension would be similar. The development would also be seen in the context of the much larger educational buildings to the rear. The character of the surrounding area also contains a variety of house types. Some have been altered and extended with single-storey and two-storey side and rear extensions, roof alterations and dormers of various sizes. In the context of rear residential extensions, the extension would not appear visually dominant. Overall, within its specific spatial and planning contexts, the proposal would be in character with the original house and there would be no detrimental impact on the appearance of No 101 or the wider street scene.
7. The depth and overall volume of the proposed extension would be a sizable addition to the host dwelling which would fail to maintain a subservient relationship with the host property. However, this would also be the case with the prior approval scheme. Furthermore, as noted above, the proposed extension would not appear significantly larger in public views than the existing extension or the prior approval extension. Evidence that the cumulative bulk of extensions to No 101 would unbalance the row of houses in which it stands is unconvincing.
8. Within the specific context of the appeal proposal, I conclude that the proposed extension would not appear intrusive, bulky or unacceptably disproportionate. There would be no harm to the character and appearance of the host property or the wider surrounding area. Despite the identified minor conflicts with the provisions of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan Policies CC1, CC2, SC7 and the SPD which, in summary and of relevance to this appeal, require residential extensions to respect their context and the character of the surrounding area, the appeal proposal is acceptable.
9. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed. The use of matching external materials is required by condition to protect visual amenities. I have also included a condition identifying the approved drawings for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Elaine Benson INSPECTOR