



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 14 September 2020

by Rachael Pipkin, BA (Hons), MPhil, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th September 2020

Appeal A Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3255159
149 Cranford Lane, Hounslow, TW5 9JA

- 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 P Khanna against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref: 00315/149/P3 dated 27 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey side/rear (in-fill) extension & first floor side extension.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3255160
149 Cranford Lane, Hounslow, TW5 9JA

- 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 P Khanna against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref: 00315/149/P5 dated 12 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey side/rear in-fill extension.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is allowed, and planning permission is granted for single storey side/rear infill extension at 149 Cranford Lane, Hounslow, TW5 9JA in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 00315/149/P5 dated 12 March 2020, subject to the conditions set out below:
 - 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: Location Plan, 20/149/CLH/601, 20/149/CLH/602 and 20/149/CLH/603.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Procedural Matter

3. As set out above there are two appeals on this site. Both appeals A and B propose an identical single-storey ground floor extension. They differ only in that Appeal A includes a first floor side extension. I have considered each proposal on its individual merits. However, to avoid duplication I have dealt with the two schemes together, except where otherwise indicated.
4. The existing plans indicate that the property has a single-storey side extension to the boundary with Northfield Road. However, at the time of my site visit, this had been demolished. For the avoidance of doubt, my determination of the appeal is based on the drawings submitted.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in both appeals is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

6. Number 149 Cranford Lane (No. 149) is a modest two-storey semi-detached house which occupies a prominent corner position at the junction of Cranford Lane and Northfield Road with which it has a long frontage. Northfield Road is laid out as an estate of properties set back from the footpath behind grass verges and set around an area of open space fronting Cranford Lane and on the opposite side of the junction to the appeal property. This spacious layout of the Northfield Road estate gives the area an open character.
7. No. 149 has a side and large rear single-storey ground floor extension. The proposed ground floor extension would connect these but would be lower in height than both and shorter in length than the rear extension. It would also be slightly set back from the boundary wall. In this context, whilst it would be visible above the boundary wall from Northfield Road, it would not appear excessively long or unduly prominent. Furthermore, because of the grass verge along this section of the boundary it would not be directly adjacent to the footpath and would not appear overbearing.
8. The house has already been extended significantly at both ground floor and roof level which have significantly increased the size and bulk of this modest property. The addition of this small ground floor extension, being both lower in height and shorter in length than the rear extension, would not appear either dominant or disproportionate to the original house either on its own or in combination with the other extensions.
9. The first floor extension would extend above the existing side extension, set back from the front elevation and below the main roof. Whilst it would appear subordinate to the host property, it would nevertheless appear as a bulky addition due to its width extending to the boundary. The flank wall of the extension would butt up to the footpath on Northfield Road as there is no grass verge along this section. It would extend upwards to approximately 7 metres presenting a stark and almost featureless façade at this prominent corner that would loom over the adjoining public footpath, having an unduly imposing and overbearing impact on pedestrians. The additional bulk at first floor level would erode the open character providing no transition between the main two-storey house and the footpath.

10. Whilst the erection of a boundary fence or revised design to the flank wall to soften the visual impact of the first floor extension could provide some visual relief from the extension, it would not overcome the harm arising from the additional bulk and overbearing impact of it.
11. I conclude that the proposed development in Appeal A would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015. These policies together require development to respect the context and character of the site and area and to complement the original building and maintain the character of the general street scene. I have also found that it would conflict with the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in respect of residential extensions to corner properties.
12. In regard to Appeal B, I conclude that it would not harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. It would therefore accord with the aforementioned policies and SPD.

Other Matter

13. The Council raised a concern about the narrowness of the gap between the proposed ground floor extension and the fence which it considered would accumulate litter, dirt and garden waste and would be inaccessible. However, this was not a reason for refusal. In any case, I have no firm evidence that this could not be adequately maintained. I therefore give this very limited weight.

Conditions

14. The Council has suggested a number of conditions should the appeals be allowed. In respect of Appeal B, I have considered these against advice in the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. A condition specifying the approved plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In the interests of character and appearance, I have imposed a condition requiring materials to match existing.

Conclusion

15. I have found that the first floor extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area but not the ground floor extension. For this reason, I conclude that Appeal A should be dismissed, and Appeal B should be allowed.

Rachael Pipkin

INSPECTOR