



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2017

by A A Phillips BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/17/3173890

332 Great West Road, Hounslow TW5 0BA

- 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 Manmohan Ranger against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00505/332/P5, dated 14 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey side and rear infill extension, a front porch and a side roof extension to convert the existing house into two self-contained flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey side and rear infill extension, a front porch and a side roof extension to convert the existing house into two self-contained flats at 332 Great West Road, Hounslow TW5 0BA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00505/332/P5, dated 14 September 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 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: Location Plan, Existing Ground Floor Plan, Existing First Floor Plan, Existing Elevations, Proposed Ground Floor Plan, Proposed First Floor Plan, Proposed Elevations, Block Plan, Roof Plan and Section AA.
 - 3) No additional windows or other glazed openings shall be formed in the side walls of the building hereby approved and no additional doors inserted in the building without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until full details of parking and servicing arrangements including bin and cycle storage shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Once approved the details shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted and retained thereafter.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the loss of a small family house on the character of the residential area and on the Borough's housing stock.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two storey semi-detached property situated in a mainly residential part of Hounslow where there is a predominance of single family dwellings. The property has a single storey extension to the rear and parking spaces into the front. Most properties in the vicinity of the appeal site are of similar design with cat slide roofs and low eaves which provide a uniform appearance.
4. The proposal would convert the existing house into two separate flats; a three bedroom ground floor flat comprising a kitchen with lounge/dining room, two en suite double bedrooms, a single bedroom and a main bathroom and a first floor one bedroom flat with a kitchen, lounge, double bedroom and bathroom. Both flats would have access to separate outdoor amenity space to the rear.
5. Policy SC6 of the Hounslow Local Plan (the LP) seeks to manage the sub-division of existing houses and a minimum original floor area of 130 square metres is required for a house to be considered suitable for sub-division. The justification for this is to reflect the minimum standards of internal space required for new development. The appeal property has an original floor area of approximately 110 square metres and so falls below the minimum threshold. However, it is not disputed that both of the proposed flats meet the relevant gross internal space standards for flats, bedroom sizes and the proposed levels of occupancy.
6. Overall I am satisfied with the outlook from the bedrooms, although I have noted that each is single aspect only. Three of the four are south facing and therefore would have good access to sunlight and the front bedroom of the ground floor flat would face onto the front car parking area. However, outside this bedroom a landscaped space would be provided at a suitable height and this relationship is not uncommon in relation to living accommodation and front gardens elsewhere. The existing rear garden would be divided into two separate areas to serve each of the two proposed flats.
7. Consequently, although the overall floor area falls below that which is considered acceptable under the development plan the proposal would not result in a cramped or crowded form of development on the site and would provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupants in terms of space and living conditions. Furthermore, the proposal would provide a three bedroom five bed space residential unit on the ground floor which in accordance with the development plan would be suitable family accommodation.
8. The proposed parking and servicing arrangements for the storage of waste and recycling are acceptable; however, more detailed arrangements should be secured through a suitably worded condition.
9. From the evidence before me and my own observations on site there are some flats and other commercial and service uses in the area. However, the vast majority of properties are single family residential dwellings. The physical appearance of the area would not be harmed by the proposal and I do not consider that the overall residential character would be harmed. The proposal

would have no significant impact on the overall residential character of the site which is capable of accommodating the proposed two residential units.

10. Although I understand that the existing property is less than the minimum required original floor area for such sub-divisions, the proposal does meet the other requirements of Policy SC6. Therefore, I do not consider that the overall objective of the policy would be prejudiced by the proposal.
11. The Council's reason for refusal also relates to the loss of a single family dwelling house in a location which is considered to be inappropriate for sub-division into more than one dwelling. However, other than the original floor area of the house no arguments are advanced by the Council as to why this is the case. Therefore, in the light of my assessment above I do not consider that the proposal would be harmful to the character of the residential area and the Borough's housing stock. As such it would not be contrary to the objectives of Policies SC6, CC1, SC1 and SC5 of the LP which, among other things, seek to ensure that new development preserves and enhances the character of the Borough, to maximise the supply of housing in the Borough in a manner that is consistent with sustainable development principles, ensure that new housing contributes to improving the quality and design of housing in the Borough and manages the sub-division of buildings to meet the prevailing housing need without having an adverse impact on the character of the area or residents' amenity.

Conditions

12. I have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. In the interests of protecting the living conditions of adjacent residential occupants I have attached a condition requiring there to be no new openings in the side walls of the development approved. I have also conditioned details of parking and servicing arrangements in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. Therefore, for the reasons given above and taking into account other matters raised I conclude that the proposal is in accordance with the development plan taken as a whole and that the appeal should be allowed.

Alastair Phillips

INSPECTOR