
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2020

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 25 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/20/3248624

44 Hornbeam Crescent, Brentford TW8 8NE

- 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 Seif Aref against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00624/44/P3, dated 4 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension to the existing house and the erection of a two-storey side extension to create an additional end of terrace house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. It is considered that the main issues are the effects of the proposed development on (a) the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene and (b) the safety of other highway users.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey end of terrace dwelling located at a road junction. The area is characterised by inter-war semi-detached dwellings and terraces formed of 4 properties. These dwellings are of a similar scale and design and are generally sited to the rear of front gardens which are landscaped or used for parking. The streetscene has a spacious character and appearance.
4. Where dwellings are located on corner plots by junctions, they are either orientated at an angle towards the junction or their side elevation are set back from the boundary. The areas around the junction accentuate the spacious character and appearance of the streetscene because of their siting and gardens. The solid form of the means of enclosure associated with the temple at the junction of Hornbeam Crescent and Beech Avenue is atypical of the character and appearance of the streetscene.
5. Some of the dwellings have been altered, including 49 and 50 Hornbeam Crescent which are a pair of semi-detached properties that possess 2-storey side extensions. It was not possible during the site visit to observe whether

these dwellings also possess rear extensions. The 3 other dwellings within the appeal property's terrace have not been altered or extended.

6. The proposed development includes the replacement of a single storey side addition by a larger 2-storey extension which would create a new dwelling. What would normally be a flank wall would be the proposed dwelling's front elevation and it would have frontage to the footway. To the rear of the host property a single storey extension would be erected which would adjoin the side extension.
7. The Council's objection to the proposed alterations is not based upon the principle of creating a new dwelling but the scale and design of the side and rear extensions, including the creation of a wraparound extension. The Council's *Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document* (REG) refers to any wraparound proposal that connects a side extension to a rear extension on a corner plot being refused. Other than reference to the exposed location of corner plots, no details or criteria concerning why such extensions would cause harm are identified.
8. Within the context of the frontage of the terrace within which the property is located the proposed side extension would appear a subordinate addition by reason of its design, width and height. However, the depth of the proposed 2-storey side extension would fail to respect the design, form and character of the terrace and other dwellings, including at road junctions.
9. By reason of the proposed side extension's scale, the spacious character of the area around the road junction would be substantially harmed, including by the potential removal of some of the boundary hedge. Some vegetation would need to be removed to create a pedestrian access to the front door and, potentially, enable daylight to reach the proposed secondary window of the ground floor habitable room. The existing single storey addition to the property does not have the same adverse impact upon the streetscene around the junction because of its smaller size, height and screening.
10. When assessed solely as alterations to the host property, including taking into account the existing addition, the cumulative scale and design of the proposed extensions would significantly increase the size and bulk of the property. There would also be a significant increase in the footprint and floorspace of the host property. Although near-by dwellings have been extended, the proposed significant increase in the size of the property would not reflect the scale and character of other similarly designed dwellings. The existing substantial boundary hedge would mitigate to some degree the view of the appeal scheme but the unacceptable harm identified would still be visible from the rear gardens of the neighbouring dwellings.
11. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene and, as such, it would conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030: Volume 1 (LP) and the design guidance in the REG. Amongst other matters, these policies require development to enhance particular features or qualities that contribute to an area's character, support high quality urban design and architecture, and for alterations and additions not to harm the existing character and appearance of a building.

Highway Safety

12. To address the Council's concerns associated with the claimed inadequate visibility splay for the proposed off-street parking provision, the appellant has suggested that this element of the appeal scheme could be removed and replaced by on-street parking. However, this amendment has not been the subject of any specific or detailed consultation with, for example, neighbouring occupiers or the Highway Authority. For this reason, the appeal has been determined based upon the scheme considered by the Council.
13. It was evident from the site visit that the hard surfaced area proposed for off-street parking within the rear garden could have been used for such a purpose previously. There is both a gated access which is of sufficient width for vehicular access and a dropped kerb.
14. No evidence has been put forward by the Council to suggest that the use of this vehicular access could not be resumed. By reason of there already being a vehicular access, it is concluded that there would be no unacceptable change to the safety of other highway users as a consequence of the proposed development and, as such, a conflict would not arise with LP Policy EC2 concerning the provision of parking spaces.

Conclusion

15. Although the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the safety of other highway users, this issue is demonstrably outweighed by the significant harm which would be caused to the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR