



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2025 by M Long BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/25/3360375

203 Boston Manor Road, Brentford, Hounslow TW8 9LF

- 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 Sukhdeep Basra against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/2462.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension and a new front porch to replace existing entrance canopy.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and,
 - if there is any harm identified under the first main issue, whether such harm is outweighed by the personal circumstances put forward by the appellant.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. The end-of-terrace appeal dwelling occupies a corner plot at the junction of Boston Manor Road and Swyncombe Avenue. The dwelling is set back from the front boundary with the highway and is also set in from the side boundary, which affords a sense of spaciousness at the corner. This space, in addition to the greenery of the nearby street trees, positively contributes to an attractive residential environment at the entrance into Swyncombe Avenue.
5. Due to its height and the extent of brickwork, in combination with its very close proximity to the side boundary, the gable end elevation would be an overly dominant feature when experienced in the vicinity of the junction. Despite its set back from the front elevation and the proposed matching external materials and joinery details, the mass of the gable sided extension would appear cramped and would unacceptably reduce the spacious quality of the corner plot, to the detriment of the immediate street scene.

6. From what I have seen, the proposal would meet some of the guidance set out in 'The Residential Guidelines (2017)'. The Council has also provided relevant extracts from the Hounslow Character, Sustainability and Design Codes Supplementary Planning Document: Part A5 Residential Extensions Guidelines (2024) which includes similar guidance. Nevertheless, in the context of the corner plot in this particular instance, the design, scale and position of the proposed development would harmfully detract from the character and appearance of the appeal site's immediate surroundings.
7. I have seen that a single-storey side extension relating to the appeal dwelling has previously been approved by the Council (LPA Ref: P/2024/0318). That particular extension would have a similar footprint to the appeal proposal and would also have a side elevation constructed very close to the boundary. However, the modest height of that particular extension would ensure that it would not have as dominant an effect on the street scene as the appeal proposal.
8. The full details of two-storey side extensions to other dwellings on Boston Manor Road and Swyncombe Avenue are not before me and so I cannot be certain of the full planning context in which they may have received planning permission. Nevertheless, from the submitted information and my own observations, many of those developments are located between dwellings rather than on a corner plot, which limits their prominence within the street scene.
9. The examples provided of extensions at corner plot locations predominantly have hipped roof forms with large set downs from the ridgeline. Indeed, this is the case to the opposite corner at 201 Boston Manor Road where the hipped roof form of the dwelling in that instance limits the extent of the brickwork next to the side boundary of the plot. That design affords a greater sense of space at the roof level, appearing less dominant than the tall gable end design of the appeal proposal and so it is not comparable.
10. I conclude that the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such it would be contrary to The London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030, specifically Policies SC7, CC1 and CC2 which together, amongst other things, support high quality urban design and architecture, require development to maintain the character of the general street scene and to sensitively respond to an area's character. There would also be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to ensure developments are sympathetic to local character.

Personal Circumstances

11. Paragraph 12 of the Framework confirms, amongst other things, that the development plan is the starting point for decision making and where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan, permission should not usually be granted.
12. I have given due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which sets out the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. I have also had regard to the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998.

13. In these respects, I am aware that a member of the appellant's family has evolving mobility requirements. The appellant has indicated that the proposal would provide additional accommodation at the ground floor that would meet the comfort and accessibility needs of that family member. I have no reason to doubt that this would be the case and that, in this regard, the proposal has the potential to be beneficial to the family member concerned. This is a personal circumstance to which I afford weight in favour of the appeal.
14. However, the proposal is not just for improvements to access and accommodation at the ground floor, and it is clear some of the accommodation would go beyond the requirements of the indicated family member. Furthermore, there is nothing to suggest that suitable access and accommodation for the specified family member could not be provided through a scheme that is more sympathetic to local character and appearance. In weighing the personal circumstances in the balance, this has to be considered against the unacceptable effect that the development would have on the character and appearance of the area.
15. Overall, a refusal of planning permission is a proportionate and necessary approach to protecting the character and appearance of the area for the wider public. Furthermore, the protection of the public interest cannot be achieved by means that are less interfering of the specified family member's human rights and the personal circumstances put forward in this instance do not outweigh the unacceptable effects of the proposal.

Other Matters

16. I acknowledge that the appellant and their family have formed personal connections with the appeal dwelling and the locality, and that the proposal would provide improved living accommodation for them. Nevertheless, this would be a private benefit to a single household and does not justify the identified harm to the character and appearance of the area.
17. While there have been no substantive concerns raised with regard to neighbouring living conditions or trees, and no third-party objections have been received, the lack of harm identified in these regards are neutral factors in the balance.

Conclusion and Recommendation

18. The proposal would be contrary to the development plan and material considerations that have been advanced in this instance do not justify a decision other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Long

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

19. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell INSPECTOR