



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2024

by Rebecca McAndrew, BA Hons, MSc, PG Dip Urban Design, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/24/3351477

32 Burlington Road, Isleworth, Hounslow TW7 4LY

- 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 Shabana Akhtar against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/1471.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part first floor side extension, alterations to the existing rear windows and the addition of two roof lights in the rear extension and one escape window to the side dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have taken the description of development in the banner above from the Council's Decision Notice as it is more concise than that included on the Application Form.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area and the effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. Taken together, Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2031 (2015) seek to secure high quality design which responds to the context of the host property and area.
5. The Residential Extension Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (SPD) offers detailed design recommendations for how this should be achieved. This includes setting back two-storey side extensions from the front elevation of the host dwelling by at least one metre at first floor. Also, side extensions should be no more than half the width of the existing dwelling and roofs should reflect the design of the host dwelling roof and be set down.
6. I recognise that, in line with the recommendations of the SPD, the proposed side extension would be set-back at first floor level by almost one metre and its width would also positively respond to the host dwelling. These measures would ensure

that the host dwelling would remain the prominent feature. I also recognise that the proposed external materials would match the existing home.

7. However, the proposed flat roof with pitched parapet would fail to reflect the hipped roof design, including the pitch, of the host property. I acknowledge that the flat roof element would be well-screened within the streetscene, due to the parapet detail and it being set back between the appeal dwelling and neighbouring property No 34. Nevertheless, the proposed pitched roof parapet would be clearly visible. I recognise that this feature would be significantly lower than, and appear subordinate to, the main roof. However, given its limited scale, it would be out of proportion to the existing roof structure. The proposed side extension would therefore appear incongruous and at odds with the character and appearance of the existing home and streetscene.
8. Burlington Road is characterised by semi-detached houses, many of which have been extended in a variety of manners. It is therefore common for pairs of semi-detached homes to differ in appearance to each other. Consequently, whilst the proposed extension would be different in appearance to the adjoining house, it would not unduly imbalance the pair of semis. However, this would not outweigh the overall harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and area that I have described in respect of the proposed roof design.
9. In conclusion, I have found that overall, the proposed extension would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area as a consequence of the proposed incongruous design. Consequently, the scheme would conflict with LP Policies CC1, CC2, SC7, the provisions of the SPD and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework in this respect.

Living Conditions

10. The proposed first floor side extension would come closer to an existing window in the side elevation of neighbouring property, No 34, than the existing arrangement. Given that this is a side window, includes obscure glazing and faces the side elevation of the appellant's home, the outlook from this room is already limited. I note that the Council state that 2.8 metres would be retained at first floor level between the two properties. On my site visit, I observed that this is a common relationship between properties in the street. Taking all of this into consideration, the proposed extension would not give rise to a sense of overbearing or loss of outlook to this window. As such, it would not unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 34.
11. In view of the above, the appeal scheme would not conflict with LP Policies CC2 and SC7 and the SPD in so far as they seek to protect the living conditions of existing residents.

Conclusion

12. Whilst I find the proposed side extension would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, this would not be sufficient to outweigh the significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area. Therefore, the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole. For the reasons given, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR