The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 January 2017

by Patrick Whelan BA(Hons) Dip Arch MA MSc ARB RIBA RTPI

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

Decision date: 12 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/16/3163340
308 Twickenham Road, Isleworth TW7 7DU

- 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 Massimiliano Carlucci against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
- The application Ref 01137/308/P10, dated 18 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2016.
- The development proposed is the construction of a shed within the front garden.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. For clarity, I have used the address given in the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the street scene and on the character and appearance of the site.

Reasons

4. The Council considers that the proposed shed would clutter the front garden, and that its size, position, and appearance would make it stand out as an alien feature.

5. I appreciate that because of the breadth of Twickenham Road and the volume of traffic it carries, the role of the front gardens of the houses in this part of the street, in terms of the overall street scene, is more limited than might otherwise be the case. Nonetheless, the front gardens, many of which include shrubs and trees and lawns, play an important role in the streetscape. They have an established character which lacks structures of the footprint and height as proposed here. In this context, the proposed shed would appear at odds with the character of the front gardens of the houses in this part of Twickenham Road.

6. The front building lines of the houses are consistent and are a characteristic feature of the townscape of the street. Their undeveloped front gardens form a reprieve between the busy road and the houses, which a shed of such scale would undermine. While I appreciate that the two ground floor windows in front of which the proposal would stand are obscure glazed, the siting of the shed so close to them would weaken the visual connection between the house

and the street, and run against the hierarchy of space between road, garden, and house in views from the street. While I saw stores in the front gardens of two neighbouring houses, these were of a far lower height and lesser footprint than this proposal.

7. I have taken into account that the street and side boundaries around the garden are tall, and that the shed would be sited away from the front boundary. I acknowledge that its materials would match those in the side boundary enclosures. These positive factors would reduce its visual impact on the appearance of the garden. I appreciate that there is no direct access from the street to the back garden of the house, and that the shed would enclose bikes and buggies which would be a benefit to the occupiers of the house. However, this does not outweigh the significant harm identified above.

8. The proposed shed would thus harm the street scene and the character of the site. It would be in conflict with Policies CC1, CC2, and SC7 of the Local Plan 2015- 2030. These seek to create attractive, distinctive, and liveable places, and development that conserves and takes opportunities to enhance features or qualities that contribute to an area's character, which maintains the character of the general street scene, and the character of private spaces.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Patrick Whelan

INSPECTOR