



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2024

by Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/24/3353672

21 Vincent Road, Isleworth, Hounslow TW7 4LT

- 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 Nash against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow Council.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/1956.
 - The development proposed is described as 'demolition of existing single-storey side extension and erection of a new two-storey side extension'.
-

Preliminary Matter

1. The appellant's description of development is set out above. However, the appeal proposal includes a single-storey rear extension which is included in the Council's description of development. Accordingly, the rear extension is considered in this appeal.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. No objections are raised to the proposed single-storey rear extension and there are no reasons to disagree. Therefore, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed two-storey side extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property (No 21) stands towards the end of Vincent Road. There is a distinctive difference in character between the cluster of properties around the head of the cul-de-sac, including No 21, and the smaller semi-detached houses that make up a large part of the road. The plot sizes of the substantial and individually designed houses adjacent to and opposite No 21 are significantly larger than those of the more closely arranged semi-detached houses. As a result, openness between buildings is a characteristic of the area immediately around the appeal site.
5. The proposed side extension would broadly encompass the footprint of the existing single-storey side extension which it would replace. However, it would extend to the side boundary over two levels, filling the upper-level space between the host property and its neighbour. The proposed development would result in a significant increase in building volume which would have a much

greater visual impact than the existing single-storey extension. The extent of development proposed at first-floor level would contrast markedly with the more open character of the properties at the head of the cul-de-sac, including the adjoining No 23. Whilst this neighbouring property has been significantly extended, its recessive side extension better respects the proportions and design of the original dwelling than the appeal proposal. Additionally, the retention of openness at the side of its plot respects local character.

6. The proposed two-storey side extension would not be set down from the existing roof ridge and would be more than half of the width of the front elevation of the existing house. It would not appear as a subservient extension to the host property and in this regard would conflict with the guidance in the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines. Furthermore, even though the original design symmetry of Nos 21 and 23 has been altered, as the appellant notes, symmetry is not addressed by the design of the appeal proposal. It appears to me that there could well be scope for an alternative design approach which could meet the modern living requirements of the appellant.
7. I conclude that the proposed development would result in a bulky and incongruous extension to the host property which would harm its character and appearance and those of the immediately surrounding area. Whilst the proposal would amount to an effective use of land, this is outweighed by the identified design harms. For these reasons, the proposed development conflicts with Local Plan Policies CC1 (Context and Character), CC2 (Urban Design and Architecture) and SC7 (Residential Extensions and Alterations). It would also be counter to the detailed design guidance set out in the Residential Extension Guidelines and the similar requirement for high quality design set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.
8. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR