



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 4 November 2019

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/19/3235905

5 Carville Crescent, Brentford TW8 9RB

- 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 Ms Louise Chastney against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00209/5/P2, dated 13 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as addition of a partial first floor extension on top of existing ground floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - The effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 3 Carville Crescent with regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The area comprises short runs of two-story terraces, semi-detached houses or blocks of flats. Although there exists a mix of property types, the appeal site is an end terrace of 3 houses that mirrors the design characteristics of the houses on the opposite side of the road. The property has been extended to the rear by a single storey extension approximately the full width of the dwelling.
4. The appeal site and Number 3 Carville Crescent are splayed from one another with a generous gap between the two properties towards the front of both dwellings, that narrows towards the rear. The side elevation of the appeal property is visually prominent within the street scene due to this relationship. The first-floor extension is proposed above part of the ground floor extension closest to the boundary with No. 3.

5. The Council's Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document A Guide for Householders (2017) (SPD) advises that the width of first floor rear extensions should be no greater than half the width of the original house and should not project more than 2.5m from the original wall.
6. The proposed development would conflict with this guidance in this regard. Due to its scale, the development would fail to appear subordinate to the host dwelling. Albeit, the development would be constructed to a high quality and would incorporate fenestration details that respect the existing building, the absence of a set down in ridge line, with limited architectural detail to break up the scale and massing of the side wall elevation, and despite its set back distances from the road and the boundary, would increase the visual impact of the extension within the street scene to a harmful degree. It would therefore appear as an incongruous feature to this terrace row of properties.
7. I therefore find the proposal would be contrary to Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (2015) (Local Plan) and the Council's SPD which expect development proposals to, amongst other things, complement the original building, harmonise with adjoining properties and maintain the character of the general street-scene.

Living Conditions

8. There is no dispute between parties that the development would have an acceptable impact on the living conditions of No. 7 Carville Crescent in terms of light and outlook. From all I have seen and read I have no reason to take a different view.
9. The rear elevation of No. 3 contains a number of ground floor and first floor windows that are angled towards the appeal site. Ground floor windows of No. 3 look onto an existing boundary fence. Thus, the addition of a first floor element as proposed would not compromise the outlook from these windows.
10. I note the discrepancy between both parties in respect of the separation distance of the proposed development to the boundary with No. 3. At first floor, the closest window of No.3 would inevitably look out towards the proposed extension. However, despite its depth and overall scale, I consider that given the orientation of the two properties and the angled relationship between them, the outlook from the first floor windows would not be compromised to a harmful degree. Furthermore, the outlook from these windows is otherwise open in aspect, therefore no sense of enclosure would result.
11. On this basis, I find no harm would occur to the living conditions of the occupants of No. 3 having regard to outlook, and the proposal would accord with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Local Plan that aims to ensure that all extensions and alterations do not result in harm to the amenity of neighbouring residents, existing and future residents.

Conclusion

12. While I have found that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 3, I find it would harm the character and appearance of the area.
13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR