
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2016

by William Fieldhouse BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/16/3163029
46 Brook Road South, Brentford TW8 0PH

- 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 Henry Brinton against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application ref 00166/46/P1, dated 22 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey side infill and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single-storey side infill and rear extension at 46 Brook Road South, Brentford TW8 0PH in accordance with the terms of the application, ref 00166/46/P1, dated 22 August 2016, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect that the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the St Paul's Brentford Conservation Area within which the site is located.

Reasons

3. In accordance with relevant legislation and national policy, in considering the main issue I shall pay special attention, and give great weight, to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the St Paul's Brentford Conservation Area¹.
4. The appeal relates to a 19th century two-storey mid-terraced house with an original two-storey rear projection. To the rear of this projection is a small lean-to, and to the side of it a conservatory. Other properties in the terrace are of similar design, and some others have single-storey rear extensions. Despite these rear additions, the terrace retains much of its original character and appearance, particularly at the front and at upper floor levels at the rear. The terrace, and the appeal property, therefore make a positive contribution to the quality of the conservation area.
5. The proposal would entail the replacement of the existing lean-to and conservatory with a single-storey extension that would wrap around the two-

¹ Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") paragraph 132.

storey rear projection. It would extend the full width of the house and 2.8 metres from the rear of the original projection, and have a maximum eaves height of 2.3 metres and overall height of 2.9 metres. The walls would be faced with yellow London brick to match the existing.

6. The Council's *Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document* (2003) ("SPD") advises that extensions that completely block in the space next to, and wrap around, original rear projections will normally be refused as they are likely to lead to the loss of the staggered shape of the original house. Furthermore, in conservation areas extensions should never dominate, and original rear extensions that form a specific feature of the building or rhythm of the terrace should be preserved.
7. In this case, whilst the proposal would clearly alter the appearance of the back of the house at ground floor level, the modest scale and height of the proposal would mean that it would be subordinate to the host property and that the two-storey projection would remain the dominant rear feature. The principal front elevation of the house would be unaltered, and the proposal would be unlikely to be visible from Lateward Road meaning that the original staggered form of this part of the back of the terrace would still be apparent from the public realm.
8. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the proposal would not materially harm the character or appearance of the St Paul's Brentford Conservation Area and that it would be in accordance with national policy²; policies SC7, CC1, CC2 and CC4 of the Hounslow Local Plan Volume One (2015); and the SPD which collectively seek to ensure high quality design and the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment by requiring residential extensions to complement the original building, harmonise with adjoining properties and maintain the character of the area.
9. In addition to the standard conditions relating to the timing of development and compliance with the approved plans, it is essential that the external materials match those of the existing house in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. For the same reason, and to safeguard living conditions in the neighbouring property, it is necessary to remove permitted development rights relating to the insertion of additional doors and windows.

Conclusion

10. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

William Fieldhouse

INSPECTOR

² NPPF sections 7 and 12.

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 052/2016-03; 052/2016-04; and 052/2016-05.
- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
- 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2 Part 1 Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), no windows or doors, other than those shown on the approved plans, shall be inserted in the extension hereby permitted.

End of schedule of conditions