
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2019

by K A Taylor MSC URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Thursday, 12 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/19/3232486

42 Homefield Road, Chiswick, London W4 2LW

- 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 Hoesli Labhart against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00622/42/P7, dated 27 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 January 2019.
 - The development proposed was originally described as the proposal includes a facade retention and rebuild of the house, addition of a two storey side extension towards the front elevation allowing the re modelling of the main stair case, a basement extension that sits below the foot print of the existing house, including a front and rear lightwells, the rebuilding of the existing rear extension as well as a partial side infill extension and a remodelling of the front and rear gardens.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the retention of facade, demolish and rebuild of the house, addition of a two storey side extension, a basement extension including a front and rear light wells, single storey rear extension and a partial side infill extension at 42 Homefield Road, Chiswick, London W4 2LW, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00622/42/P7, dated 27 July 2019, and the plans submitted with it, subject to conditions set out in the schedule attached to this decision.

Procedural Issues

2. The Council accepted the planning application on a householder application form and the Council's decision was issued on that basis. However, in the letter dated 3 July 2019 it confirms the application was considered as a full planning application and a fee was received to this effect. As the Council considered it on this basis, then so shall I.
3. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the application form, the Council altered the description of the development. This is also the description used by the appellant on the appeal form. I consider this to be a more accurate and concise description of the appeal proposals and I have therefore used this description as set out in my decision.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area; and (ii) whether the

proposed development would harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupants, with reference to potential impacts and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site is within a predominantly residential area characterised by semi-detached dwellings on both sides of Homefield Road. The site lies within a locally designated area of special character and identifies the wider area as having three storey Edwardian semis, interwar two storey semis and short terraces all consisting of modest front spaces. The property forms a pair of semi-detached dwellings of similar appearance in width, characterised with features including a mansard roof, sash windows and dormers to the front, rear and side. Despite some variation in form, the properties in the area present a discreet arrangement that appreciably contributes towards the local character.
6. Although the proposed development includes the demolition and rebuilding of aspects of the property the façade of the building would be retained. This would ensure that the character and appearance of the host dwelling would remain which positively contributes to the visual appearance of the street scene and wider area.
7. In terms of the two storey extension, this would be situated along the boundary with No.40 but would be set back from the frontage and split from the main roof of the property. The materials would match, and it would appear subservient to the host dwelling and would not unduly alter the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached properties the appeal site forms and characteristics of the wider area.
8. A gap between the two properties would be retained as there is no built development to the side frontage of No.40, although the gap would be reduced it would not result in a terracing effect taking place to the detriment of the street scene.
9. I noted on my site visit that the immediate and wider area is characterised by variations to gap distances between properties, even where these have not been reduced by extensions and alterations to properties. Thus, even if there is a breach of the guidance on two storey extensions, the proposal would still accord with the overall aims of achieving high quality design in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, 2019 and development plan policy. Furthermore, it would retain the proportions, a gap and would not harm the character of the host property or wider area.
10. The single storey extension would be positioned to the rear and would replace the existing extension and includes a side infill along the boundary shared with No.44 and include skylights combined with a green roof. The site is enclosed to the rear with boundary treatments and therefore cannot be seen from Homefield Road and the surrounding area.
11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area, including the designated area of special character. It would comply with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (HLP) 2015-2030, adopted 2015 which taken together these ensure, high quality development that responds to an areas character and creates attractive,

distinctive, liveable places and requires all alterations and additions do not harm the existing character and appearance of the building and its context. It would also generally comply with the guidance set out within the London Borough of Hounslow, Residential Extension Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), 2017.

Living conditions

12. The proposed two storey side extension would not project further than the existing property to the rear and proposes no side facing windows. The existing configuration of windows on the side elevation would therefore be reduced. At present the window at first floor at No.40 does not serve a habitable room and directly faces on to the side elevation of the appeal site and would continue to do so, albeit in closer proximity the proposals, would not cause any significant loss of light than that of the existing arrangement. The proposed two storey would sit below the main roofline and the design of the sloped roof of the extension would ensure the existing roof dormer windows at No.40 would not result in any loss of light, overbearing impacts or have a bleak outlook from the proposed extension.
13. No.40 has a single storey rear extension which is served by several windows and rooflights and most of the openings face towards the rear garden area. Therefore, the position of the proposed two storey side extension is no further back than the rear elevation and would not appear dominant or overpowering. It would not result in any meaningful loss of light or cause any sense of enclosure to the rear or front of No.40. Furthermore, the proposed alterations to the two-storey rear extension would be seen in context to the existing arrangement and is set away from the boundary.
14. In terms of the single storey rear extension, this would replicate the existing footprint and proximity to the boundary of No.40. The combination of the flat roof design and the existing boundary wall between the two properties would ensure that there would be no overbearing impacts of this part of the development and it would not result in any sense of enclosure or privacy issues.
15. The height of the single storey rear infill extension along the side boundary with No.44 would be modest and would be the same height as the existing boundary fencing. The sloping roof form would reduce its impact and it would not adversely affect the light or privacy of No.44.
16. Construction would cause some disruption in terms of noise and disturbance, but this would be temporary and would be mitigated by a Construction Method Statement which could be dealt with by condition.
17. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would not cause harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. It would comply with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the HLP, 2015-2030, adopted 2015 these policies expect that the design of developments will minimise harm to neighbouring residents and future occupants and have a positive impact on amenity. It would also comply with the guidance in relation to amenity set out within the Council's SPD, 2017.

Other Matters

18. The property is within a controlled parking zone (CPZ) and has existing off road parking of a substandard size. Although this would be lost as part of the proposed development, the site lies within a sustainable location for access to public transport and could be dealt with by condition to ensure that the crossover is reinstated and additional on road parking space provided. At the time of my site visit Homefield Road and the surrounding roads, although controlled had ample free spaces to park within. As such, I do not consider that the proposed development would exacerbate existing parking infrastructure in the area or cause harm to highway safety.
19. In regard to the works to the rear garden and replacement of fencing with a boundary wall. Given the existing arrangement of the fencing and its height, I do not consider that the replacement with a boundary wall and marginal increase would be significant enough to result in an unacceptable loss of daylight/sunlight or would impair outlook than that of the existing.
20. I have considered the third parties' arguments that the grant of planning permission would set a precedent for other similar developments. However, no directly similar/comparable sites to which this might apply were put forward. Each application and appeal must be determined on its individual merits, and a generalised concern of this nature does not justify withholding permission in this case.
21. The issue of impact on property values has also been raised. It is a well-founded principle that the planning system does not exist to protect private interests such as value of land or property.

Conditions

22. A list of conditions has been seen both main parties, of which in part have been incorporated from those within the Councils appeal evidence, and, I have no evidence to suggest that they disagree with them. I have considered conditions in light of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). Other than the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the reason of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area a condition relating to external materials and the façade and in the interests of highway safety, parking and sustainable transport modes I have imposed conditions relating to the reinstatement of the crossover and the provision of suitable cycle storage.
23. In order to protect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers I have included the requirement for a construction method statement, restrictions on hours of construction activity, no further windows or openings on the two storey extension and restrictions on the use of the roof area of the rear single storey extension. A suitable refuse storage condition is also necessary.

Conclusion

24. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

K A Taylor

INSPECTOR

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/19/3232486

42 Homefield Road, Chiswick, London W4 2LW

Schedule of conditions attached to planning permission

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: A-218-HMF-ELE-020;021;022;023; 024;025, A-218-HMF-SE-030;031;033, A-218-HMF-LOC-000, A-218-HMF-PLN-001;002;003;004;005.
- 3) No development shall commence until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.
- 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows or openings other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed on the side elevation of the two storey extension hereby approved.
- 5) Demolition or construction works shall take place only between 0830 hours to 1800 hours on Monday to Fridays and 0900 hours to 1600 hours on Saturdays and shall not take place at any time on Sundays or on Bank or Public Holidays.
- 6) No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Statement shall provide for: <i>the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors; <ii>loading and unloading of plant and materials; <iii>storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development; <iv>wheel washing facilities; <v>measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction; <vi>a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works; <vii>delivery, demolition and construction working hours. The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.
- 7) No development shall commence until a method statement for the works for retention/re-use of the façade shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The method statement shall include the timing of the removal and reinstatement and measures to be taken to secure and protect the interior features against accidental loss or damage. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.
- 8) Development shall not take place until details of the crossover and footway between the proposed development and the highway shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority; and the development shall not be occupied until that crossover

and footway has been constructed in accordance with the approved details. The footway shall thereafter be retained.

- 9) Development shall not take place until details of the space within the site for bicycles to be parked shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority; and the development shall not be occupied until that space has been constructed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be kept available for the parking of bicycles.
- 10) Development shall not take place until details of covered and secure waste and recycling storage facilities shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall not be occupied until the facilities have been constructed in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained for the lifetime of the development.
- 11) The roof area of the single storey rear extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.