



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2025

by **E Heron MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/24/3355486

36 North Hyde Lane, Heston, Hounslow, TW5 0EQ

- 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 Jagmeet Singh Malhotra against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/2126.
 - The development is a proposed part single part double storey side and rear extension following demolition of existing side garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a corner plot that is viewed in context with the junction of both North Hyde Lane and The Vale, even though The Vale is closed-off to vehicles with low-level barriers. On North Hyde Lane, notwithstanding various alterations and extensions, there is discernible uniformity within the residential street scene, due to the general arrangement of strong building lines punctuated by projecting gables and bay windows. The Vale has more variety in house styles, but the strong building line is generally respected. The set-back of the houses behind gardens and generous pavements, all respecting the alignment of the street, give this area a relatively ordered and spacious suburban character.
4. There is a minor tunnelling effect on a short stretch of The Vale within the immediate context of the appeal site. This is due to the narrowing of the highway, and proximity of taller boundary features, garaging within the appeal site and the side wall of a ground floor extension opposite. Nevertheless, this harmful effect is relieved in part by the broad alignment of the upper flank wall of no 36 with the frontages of the properties on the southern side of The Vale. Hence, the building line is retained and respected above ground floor level. At the time of my site visit a hip to gable extension, dormer, and ground floor rear extension were under construction at the appeal property. Whilst elements of these extensions appear somewhat stark, overall, the siting, scale and form of the host dwelling contributes to the pleasant, ordered, and spacious suburban character of the area.

5. Whilst the rear of the two-storey extension would sit away from the angled boundary, the front portion would be positioned close to it. Its proximity to the side boundary would therefore erode the sense of spaciousness and disrupt the prevailing building line within The Vale. Its oblique angle to the side boundary also fails to respond positively to the general orderly appearance of the street scene. This harm would be exacerbated by the proposed gable end roof of the two storey extension, jutting forward of The Vale's building line of predominantly hipped gables.
6. Moreover, the rear elevation would be dominated by the wraparound extension, and cumulatively with all other elements of the proposal, the development would appear bulky and discordant with the form of the original dwelling. When viewed as part of the wider street scene its complicated appearance and side projection would disrupt the prevailing sense of orderliness and spaciousness, particularly when viewed from The Vale. This would be at odds with the Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document, adopted 20th December 2017 (SPD).
7. I have taken account of the images of other extensions in the locality provided by the appellant and viewed those properties when on site. The majority of these do not relate to corner plots and in general they appear to be subservient to the host dwelling when viewed from the front. The obvious exception is no 77 Heston Avenue, which is also a corner plot. However, its assertive and prominent presence in the street scene serves to reinforce my concerns rather than providing a sound justification for similar development. In any event, I have given greatest weight to the ordered building lines and set-backs that are strongly associated with the appeal site and as such the examples of other extensions do not lead me to a different view on this main issue.
8. Neither am I persuaded that the harmful effects I have identified would be alleviated on the basis of improved symmetry with the adjoining property at no 34.
9. For these reasons, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. As such it conflicts with Policies CC1 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030, Volume One. These policies require new development to conserve, and take opportunities to enhance the character of places, and to complement and harmonise with the original building and adjoining properties.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has referred me to a caveat within the SPD. This stipulates that whilst guidelines for corner plots should be applied wherever possible, each case will be assessed individually due to the varying styles of corner plots within the Borough. My attention has also been drawn to two appeal decisions where this caveat has been engaged. In both cases the Inspector did not find harm, for reasons that are specific to the site context. I have little convincing evidence before me that the circumstances and nature of those developments are directly comparable to the appeal proposal, which reduces the weight I attribute to them. In any case, I have considered the appeal on its individual merits, as required by the SPD.

11. It is acknowledged that the National Planning Policy Framework encourages efficient use of land in accessible locations, however it also states that good design is a fundamental matter.
12. No objections have been received from neighbours or third parties, however the lack of objections does not equate to a lack of harm. Neither does an absence of harm in relation to the effect on the living conditions of neighbours weigh in favour of the proposal as it is a requirement of other development plan policies.
13. For the above reasons I have attributed minimal weight to the above matters, and I conclude that they do not outweigh the harm caused to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

E Heron

INSPECTOR