

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2016

by Siobhan Watson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 7 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/16/3155951

1B, Fauconberg Road, Chiswick, London, W4 3JZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Simon Gentry against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00436/1B/P4, dated 27 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of a single storey house and the construction of a new two-storey house in the same location.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development upon (i) the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining dwellings in respect of daylight and outlook; and (i) the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living Conditions

3. The proposed two storey dwelling would be sited between the side elevations of the adjacent dwellings. Included in the first floor side elevations of both buildings are an obscure glazed bathroom window and a clear glazed landing window. The proposed dwelling would be sited directly opposite and roughly 1m away from these windows.
 4. I note the submitted Daylight/Sunlight Analysis Report which says that the Building Research Establishment "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice" Second Edition 2011, says that circulation areas and bathrooms do not meet the criteria for analysis. However, this does not mean that I do not need to consider the effects upon these windows and whilst I note the contents of this report, it is common sense that if you put a wall very close to a window, the light to that window will be reduced. Furthermore, the outlook from the landing windows would be detrimentally affected by having a new wall so close to them. I appreciate that these windows are not to habitable rooms but the effects upon them would be severe.
 5. I accept that there are other dwellings nearby which are both close together and have windows in their side elevations. However, these are long standing developments whereas the occupiers adjoining the appeal site currently enjoy
-

space between the upper floors which would be taken away if the development were to go ahead.

6. Furthermore, the single storey projection at the rear would be taller and bulkier than the existing conservatory and this would have a negative effect upon the outlook from No 1A. I appreciate that there is boundary planting but this cannot be regarded as permanent. I note that a couple of residents have written to say that they do not object to the proposal but this factor is not determinative.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings. Consequently, I find conflict with Policy CC2 and SC5 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (LP) which, together, seek to ensure good design with a positive impact on the amenity of current and future residents and which respects the principles of good neighbourliness.

Character and Appearance

8. The appeal site is a flat roofed single storey dwelling which sits between 2 period properties near the junction of Gordon Road and Fauconberg Road. There are long range views of it from Sutton Lane South.
9. The proposed building would align with the eaves of No 1A and would incorporate 2-storey bays to reflect the surrounding styles. However, it would have a flat roof which would be out of keeping with the hipped roofed buildings to either side. The roof would also be out of keeping with other buildings in the vicinity which commonly have pitched roofs. The proposed modern, plain lines would be in sharp contrast to the detailed architecture of the adjoining and surrounding buildings which contain features such as chimneys, sash and multi-paned windows, slate roofs, gables, and mouldings. As a consequence, the dwelling would present a stark, incongruous and prominent addition to the street-scene.
10. Whilst the existing building is out of keeping with its surroundings and also has a flat roof, its single storey nature results in it being much less prominent than a 2-storey building.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposed dwelling would harm the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with LP Policies CC1 and CC2 which seek to ensure that development respects an area's character and is of high quality urban design.

Other Matters

12. I note the appellant's comments that the existing dwelling provides unsatisfactory living accommodation and that the proposed dwelling would be constructed to be energy efficient. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have found. I have considered all other matters raised but none outweigh the conclusions I have reached.

Conclusion

13. The appeal is dismissed.

Siobhan Watson

INSPECTOR