



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 June 2025 by A Morrison MTCP MRTPI

Decision by A Walker MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/25/3363424

30 Alderney Avenue, Hounslow TW5 0QL

- 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 Ms Shailla Phillips against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/3820.
 - The development proposed is first floor side, part rear wrap around extension and porch to front elevation of dwellinghouse.
-

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 development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area; and,
 - The effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 28 Alderney Avenue with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling which includes an attached flat roofed converted garage and wrap-around single storey rear extension. Located within an area of established residential character, the appeal property is centrally situated along an orderly sequence of semi-detached houses to the southern side of Alderney Avenue. The adjacent house to the east, 28 Alderney Avenue, has a mirrored layout to the appeal dwelling, whilst adjoining 32 Alderney Avenue to the other side has a first floor side extension. In common with many other such developments in the road, many of which the appellant refers me to, this addition is set back from the principal elevation and is in line with the main rear elevation. This widespread retention of the original main depth of the buildings is a positive unifying characteristic of the semi-detached pairs.

5. From a review of the evidence, I note that there is no dispute between the parties regarding the front porch element of the scheme, and I see no reason to disagree with this conclusion. My main assessment will therefore focus on the first floor extension.
6. The proposed development would be both a side and rear enlargement to the house, extending fully across to the shared boundary with No 28 and to most of the depth of the existing rear single storey projection. Its flank elevation would have no windows and is designed with a parapet feature. Though it would be set back from the main front elevation, the resulting sizeable blank side wall would nevertheless be considerably longer than the depth of the original host dwelling. The extension would not be subordinate to the building in this key dimension, thereby failing to have sufficient regard to its existing scale, notwithstanding its subservient overall height. The absence of any side windows to alleviate its considerable massing would furthermore contribute to an ungainly appearance.
7. I recognise that the general roof form of the proposal would be appropriate to the existing dwelling and that matching materials would be used. However, by virtue of its projection well beyond the main rear building line, the extension would be of an incongruously large scale with reference to the prevailing proportions of neighbouring semi-detached properties. This harmful lack of sympathy with the depth of the host dwelling, together with those surrounding similar houses, would be plainly apparent from the street scene and would serve to undermine this consistent element of their collective character.
8. Overall, the proposal would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area. In doing so, it would conflict with Policies CC2 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030, which together expect residential extensions to be subordinate to the principal building through having regard to its scale, to respond sensitively to site characteristics and the layout and massing of surrounding buildings, and to complement the original building whilst also maintaining the character of the street scene.

Living conditions

9. The proposed extension would be sited adjacent to 28 Alderney Avenue, which has three first floor side windows facing the appeal site together with one first floor, rear facing window. I note from the evidence that the parties agree that all such side facing windows do not serve habitable rooms within this neighbouring dwelling and that on this basis, the Council has no objection to the scheme with regard to its impact on these windows. I see no reason to disagree with this conclusion.
10. In its assessment of the extension's effect upon neighbouring occupiers, the Council have however referenced that its rearward element does not comply with the maximum depth and minimum neighbouring separation distance dimensions within the relevant section of Part A5 Residential Extension Guidelines of the Hounslow Character, Sustainability and Design Codes SPD 2024 (the SPD). Whilst these guidelines illustrate typically acceptable dimensions, they also state that the scale of an acceptable first floor or two storey rear extension will be dictated by the need to protect neighbouring properties from loss of light, safeguard outlook and prevent enclosure and that this will vary based on the size of the host property and the proximity of adjoining homes.

11. Owing to the spacing of No 28's rear bedroom first floor window comfortably away from the proposed extension and taking into consideration its relative positioning to this new massing, I am satisfied that there would only be a very limited adverse impact upon outlook and light conditions with respect to this room. In addition, given that the development would not extend beyond this adjacent dwelling's ground floor rear building line, I find that there would be no material harm caused to the existing outlook and light conditions afforded to its ground floor rear openings and adjoining rear patio seating area. Accordingly, the scheme would not give rise to an undue sense of enclosure to this neighbouring occupier in any respect.
12. On this basis, the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 28 Alderney Avenue, with particular regard to outlook and light. It would therefore satisfy Policies CC2 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 in this particular respect. The relevant parts of these policies expect residential extensions to minimise harm to neighbouring residents including through avoiding an unacceptable loss of outlook, light and sense of enclosure, minimising overbearingness and to have regard to guidance in Supplementary Planning Documents. By appropriately safeguarding neighbouring living conditions, the extension would also meet the relevant guidance in the SPD.

Other Matters

13. The appellant's evidence refers to a long-standing similar extension at 2 Alderney Avenue. The effect of the appeal scheme would however not be closely comparable to the development to this end dwelling in the road, due to spatial considerations including the retained spacing to its side and its juxtaposition adjacent to the rear of neighbouring properties on Jersey Road. As such, the circumstances at this property are materially different and do not justify unacceptable development at the appeal site.
14. I appreciate that the scheme would restore a sense of balance to the front elevations of Nos 30 and 32 as a semi-detached pair. However, this effect could equally be achieved through an alternative scheme which does not harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. I am satisfied that the proposed development would not detract from the living conditions of the occupiers of 28 Alderney Avenue. Nevertheless, this would not outweigh the harmful impact it would have on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area. I conclude the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations, including the Framework, that would outweigh that conflict. It is for this reason and having had regard to all other matters raised that I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Morrison

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

A Walker

INSPECTOR