
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2016

by Jonathan Price BA(Hons) DMS DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 4th November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/16/3149824

3 Tennyson Road, Hounslow, London TW3 4AN

- 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 Grace Leung against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01115/3/P1, dated 25 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is described in the application form as follows:
'The proposed side extension will be an individual dwelling unit as no. "3A Tennyson Road", comprises up to three bedrooms with off-street parking space at the front. The habitable space inside the proposed 3A Tennyson Road has been carefully designed and orientated to ensure the dwelling provides adequate standard of living condition within the limitation constraint by the site. A Part M compliant WC facility is provided at the ground floor, with open kitchen at the back and dining and living space to the front. Open curtilage is provided both at the front and the back. The extension will be constructed 1.3m away from the boundary shared with 5 Tennyson Road. No window is proposed at the gable end to maintain the privacy of neighbouring 5 Tennyson Road. As the proposed extension is sufficiently set away from the site boundary to the west of neighbouring 5 Tennyson Road, the daylight and sunlight of 5 Tennyson Road will not be adversely affected. The unsightly, now redundant garage will be demolished as part of the proposal'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant has referred in the statement to possible amendments to the scheme which seek to overcome the Council's reasons for refusal, but has not submitted any revised plans since the appeal. The *Procedural Guide*¹ advises that any such amendments should normally be progressed through a fresh planning application and the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme. Accordingly, this appeal has been determined on the basis of the submitted plans, to which the Council's decision referred.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this case are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

¹ Procedural Guide – Planning Appeals England – Annexe M.1.1 and M.2.1

- Whether the proposal would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers, with particular regard to internal and external living space.
- The effect on the safety and convenience of users of the adjoining highway.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The housing in Tennyson Road, and much of the surrounding area, is of a generally uniform character, comprising mainly semi-detached houses of a comparable scale. These dwellings are arranged to a regular pattern, set back from the road to an even building line with small front gardens, some of which have been given over to car parking. Nos 1 and 3 form a pair of semi-detached houses which, like Nos 2/4 and 6/8 opposite, are of a slightly wider and less deep plan compared to the other houses along this street and feature gable-fronted sections at each end.
5. The proposal is to create a separate dwelling by extending No 3 at the side over an area currently mainly occupied by a detached single garage. The accommodation would be on three floors with three bedrooms, including one on the second floor within a rear dormer and the new roof space. The extension would be the full width of the main part of the host dwelling and its projecting gable, necessitating a crown roof design to keep to the height of the existing building.
6. Whilst two-storey side extensions have been added to the similarly-designed semi-detached houses opposite, at Nos 4 and 6, these achieve a satisfactory level of subordination to the original dwellings by having hipped roofs and first floor elements set back from the projecting front gable parts, in line with the main front walls of the houses. This proposal would extend the host dwelling to the line of front wall of the projecting front gable, terminating with a relatively wide gable end. There would be a large rear dormer which, whilst slightly off-set, would be the full width of the new dwelling and rise to the height of the crown-roof.
7. Although the extension would be in materials matching the adjoining part of the existing house, and maintain a separation of some 1.3m from the side boundary to the neighbouring house at No 5, the effect would be to over-dominate the host dwelling and significantly disrupt the present balanced appearance of the existing semi-detached pair. The extensions would not achieve the subordination in scale sought by the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines². The lead-effect clad rear dormer, occupying the full width of the new dwelling, and occupying the full vertical extent of the rear roof between eaves-level and its ridge, would be excessively large and out of character with the rest of the dwelling and further conflict with these guidelines.
8. This proposal would not be supported by the precedents provided by the extensions carried out at Nos 4 and 6, for the reasons given. Neither does No 5 already detract from the balanced appearance of this neighbourhood, as this next door dwelling is a semi-detached house similar to the majority of others further along this street. The appeal scheme would, for the reasons explained, be harmful to the character and appearance of the main house and

² London Borough of Hounslow Residential Extension Guidelines – October 2003.

of the area in general. The proposals would not be supported by Local Plan³ (LP) Policy CC1 which seeks that new developments enhance the character of an area and poor quality design be refused. The scheme would not meet the aims of LP Policy CC2 to promote high quality urban design and architecture, or those of LP Policy SC7, which require residential extensions to complement the original building, harmonise with adjoining properties and maintain the character of the general street scene.

Living conditions

9. This proposal must be assessed on the plans submitted, which provide for three bedrooms, including the double room proposed on the second floor. Policy 3.5 of the London Plan⁴ requires that new homes should have adequately sized rooms and adopts the Government's nationally described space standard⁵. The new dwelling would provide a double bedroom and two single bedrooms and be at three storeys. The space standards would indicate a desirable gross minimum internal floor area of 90m² for a dwelling of this nature and this proposal would fall significantly below this by providing an internal floor area of just 72m². Furthermore, both the single bedrooms would fall below the minimum size standard of 7.5m². Consequently, the proposed dwelling would not meet the Council's adopted internal space standards and fail to satisfy Policy 3.5 of the London Plan.
10. The host dwelling has a relatively shallow rear garden, which would be subdivided by the width of the new dwelling to provide it a small rear patio area. LP Policy SC5 requires that new houses demonstrate compliance with the external space standards it sets out. These set a minimum standard of 50m² for dwellings with 3 habitable rooms, 60 m² for those with 4 habitable rooms and 75 m² where there would be 5 or more habitable rooms. The Council calculates that the outside living space to the rear and side of the new dwelling would be less than 30m² which for a three bedroom unit, capable of accommodating a small family, would be insufficient and fall substantially below the standards set by Policy SC5.
11. The amount of internal and external space proposed would fail to provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers. Consequently, this proposal would be contrary to LP Policy SC5 and Policy 3.5 of the London Plan in respect of the quality of living accommodation provided.

Highway safety and convenience

12. The appellant advises that the current occupiers of No 3 do not own a vehicle but that there would be adequate space for three cars to park. The plans show the proposed dwelling having a car parking space accessed from the existing vehicular entrance. An additional dropped kerb and access would be provided for the existing house, serving two further off-street parking spaces. Although not shown on the plans, the appellant states that the front boundary hedge would be replaced by a low wall to allow pedestrian visibility splays onto the footpath. The front garden area of this property is already fully hard-surfaced.

³ London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030.

⁴ The London Plan – The Spatial Development Strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011 – March 2016.

⁵ Technical Housing Standards – nationally described space standard - Department for Communities and Local Government March 2015.

13. From my inspection Tennyson Road appears to be already subject to parking stress, with most available on-street provision fully occupied at the time of my visit. Many other dwellings in this area have hard surfaced front gardens used as off-street parking. However, I agree with the Council that the three spaces shown, one for the new house and two for the existing dwelling, would not be safely or conveniently accessible. The lack of cycle storage would, however, be a matter that could be satisfactorily addressed by means of a planning condition. However, as submitted, the plans would not demonstrate an adequate standard for the provision of off-street car parking and this would have a harmful effect on the safety and convenience of users of the adjoining highway and be contrary to the aims of LP Policy EC2 and Policy 6.13 of the London Plan.

Conclusions

14. For the reasons set out, this proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area more generally, fail to provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers, with regard to amounts of internal and external living space, and have a detrimental impact on the safety and convenience of users of the adjoining highway. Having taken into consideration all matters raised, I conclude therefore that this appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathan Price

INSPECTOR