The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 July 2019

by R Lankshear BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/19/3226709
88 Bassett Gardens, Isleworth TW7 4QY

- 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 Narinder Lakhan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
- The application Ref 00082/88/P6, dated 01 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 January 2019.
- The development proposed is described as 'Part First Floor Side/Rear Extension'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised in February 2019 and this post-dates the Council's refusal notice. I have determined this appeal in accordance with the 2019 Framework.

3. The appeal has not been submitted by the applicant as stated on the application form. Confirmation has been received from the applicant that their son, stated as the appellant on the appeal form, will conduct the appeal on their behalf. I am satisfied to progress the appeal on this basis.

4. The description of development that appears in the banner heading above is taken from the planning application form. The Council's decision notice refers to the description of development as the 'erection of first floor rear extension to the house'. This more accurately describes the appeal proposal and I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on i) the living conditions of the occupiers of 86 Bassett Gardens (No 86) with particular reference to outlook and; ii) the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling situated within a residential street scene of similar properties. The appeal property has been extended in

the past including a two-storey side extension adjacent to the boundary with No 86 and a single storey rear extension. The properties are stepped in the street scene with the appeal property being set back from the road frontage compared to No 86.

7. The appeal development would extend above the existing single storey rear projection with a flat roof to the eaves height of the existing dwelling (approximately 5.6 metres) and depth of approximately 3.7 metres that would be situated approximately 0.6 metres from the boundary with No 86.

Living conditions

8. By virtue of the stagger between the properties and proximity of the extension to the boundary, the proposed development would project beyond the rear elevation of No 86, introducing two storey mass adjacent to the rear garden of the neighbouring property. Whilst noting the southern outlook from the rear of the properties, from my site observations it was evident that the addition of a first floor above the existing single storey rear projection would be visually dominant when viewed from the rear of No 86, particularly from the rear garden. Noting this, given its depth, two storey height and position adjacent to the boundary, I consider that the proposals would have a significant enclosing effect on the outlook enjoyed by occupiers of No 86, particularly when viewed from the rear garden area.

9. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposed development would have a significantly harmful impact on the living conditions of occupiers of No 86, by reason of loss of outlook and enclosing effect. Consequently, it would not accord with the living conditions aims of policy SC7 of the adopted London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (LP)[1], Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and the Framework which seeks a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Character and appearance

10. The Council indicate that the proposed extension would technically exceed the guidance in terms of depth and width contained within the SPD and would therefore harm the character and appearance of the area. The extent of any such harm should however be considered having regard to the individual circumstances of the proposals and their impact.

11. Given the existing pattern of development, including the extensions to the host property and the appeal proposal's position to the rear, the development would not be overly visible from the street scene of Bassett Gardens. To the rear of the property is Osterley station which is set down within a cutting that minimises any views from this vantage point. Although medium range views of the rear of the property may be possible from the car park serving the station, these are limited in their extent. Noting the appeal development's position to the rear and the lack of substantive views towards it, I do not consider that the extension would unacceptably impact upon the character and appearance of the area.

[1] Adopted September 2015

12. For these reasons I do not consider that the proposals would be at odds with the character and design aims of policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the adopted LP, the Residential Extension Guidelines SPD and the Framework.

Other matters

13. The appellant has raised concern with the manner in which the Council determined the application. This is not directly relevant to my assessment of the merits of the appeal proposal and does not alter my conclusions on impact upon living conditions of occupiers of No 86.

Conclusion

14. Although I have identified no harm to the character and appearance of the area this does not outweigh the harm including conflict with the development plan in relation to the first main issue in this case. Accordingly, for the reasons outlined above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Robert Lankshear

INSPECTOR