



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 February 2025

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/25/3359193

19 Gainsborough Gardens, Isleworth, Hounslow, TW7 7PE

- 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 Dan Chandegra against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/3274.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side, part single storey rear and first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two storey side, part single storey rear and first floor rear extension at 19 Gainsborough Gardens, Isleworth, Hounslow, TW7 7PE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2024/3274, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan; AH 735 01; AH 735 02; AH 735 03; AH 735 04; AH 735 05 and AH 735 06.
 - 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.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows/dormer windows shall be constructed on the north east flank elevation of the first floor extension hereby approved.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have used the Council's description of the development in the above banner heading as it provides a full description of the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey, semi-detached dwelling located in an area comprising of similar properties.
5. Policies CC1 and CC2 of the LP expect proposals to respond to the context and character of the area in terms of design, whilst Policy SC7 requires residential alterations to complement the original building and harmonise with adjoining properties. The Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (SPD) whilst non-statutory, provides further useful design guidance.
6. The proposed two storey side extension would be set back from the main front wall of the host dwelling by 1m and would have a lower ridge height. The extension would be flush with the main front wall at single storey level although it would be set back from the forward-projecting front porch. Whilst the SPD advises that ground floor extensions should also be set back from the main front elevation of the dwelling, the extension would overall, appear subservient to the host dwelling when approached from Gainsborough Gardens.
7. The appeal property occupies an end plot and the proposed two storey side extension would extend up to the side boundary of the site. Whilst the Council consider that a 1m set back from the boundary would be required to comply with the SPD advice in relation to corner plots, the lack of a set back would be of little consequence in this case as the site is directly adjacent to a large area of open space. Consequently, the extension would not lead to any adverse overbearing or terracing effects.
8. The SPD advises that first floor extensions should be proportionate and subordinate to the dimensions of the main house and that the width of a first-floor rear extension should be no greater than half the width of the original house. The proposed first floor extension would extend slightly over half the width of the original rear elevation. The side extension would extend beyond the original rear elevation of the dwelling by about 3.6m and would combine with the first-floor rear extension, resulting in a large addition to the rear of the dwelling. However, the side/rear extension would be subservient in height to the host dwelling and would not significantly overwhelm its original form or lead to an overdevelopment of the site. The design of the proposed extensions would be in keeping with that of the host dwelling and accordingly, would not be detrimental to its character and appearance.
9. Whilst the extensions would be visible from the adjacent open space particularly at first floor level, the proposal would not lead to any significant visual harm or detract from the openness of the surrounding land. Furthermore, the proposed extensions would be distant from the dwellings to the rear and would not appear visually dominant when viewed from them.
10. The proposed single storey extension would be in a similar position as an existing single storey garage to be demolished. Its depth would exceed that recommended in the SPD, but it would have a narrow width and a low height with a flat roof design and would appear sufficiently subservient to the host dwelling. Furthermore, it would not be visually prominent when viewed from outside the site and would have no significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

11. Despite some conflict with the SPD, the proposed extensions would respond to the context and character of the area in terms of design and would complement the original building. Accordingly, the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area and would comply with the design objectives of Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the LP.

Other Matters

12. The proposed extensions are sited away from the boundary with 17 Gainsborough Gardens and I agree with the Council's assessment that the proposal would not lead to any significant overshadowing or loss of outlook to No 17. There are no side windows proposed at first floor level facing No 17 and the privacy of the adjoining occupiers would be maintained. The insertion of windows in the first floor flank elevation of the extension could be satisfactorily controlled by a condition.
13. Existing parking to the front of the dwelling and the large garage to the rear would be retained and I have no evidence before me to suggest that the proposal would result in any significant or unacceptable increase in on-street parking.
14. Some noise and disturbance can be expected with any development proposal but would be short lived. Any unreasonable occurrence of noise or disturbance would be the subject of other legislation.
15. The effect on property values is not a planning consideration and is therefore outside the scope of this appeal.
16. I have assessed the appeal on its merits. Third party comments about previous alterations to the boundary treatment and the suggestion of possible commercial activity on the site are not relevant to the consideration of the proposal.

Conditions

17. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans condition is imposed for certainty. A condition requiring the use of matching materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area. I have imposed a condition to prevent additional windows being formed on the north east elevation of the first floor extension in order to protect the living conditions of the adjoining occupiers.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR