
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 January 2020

by Anne Jordan BA (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21st January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/19/3237500

47 Harvesters Close, Isleworth, TW7 7PS

- 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 Mrs Jaswinder Rignall against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01472/47/P1, dated 21 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is an out building to be used as summer house and for storage purposes only.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues for the appeal are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of residential occupiers of the host dwelling, and
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living Conditions

3. Harvester Close is a residential cul-de-sac. Properties are arranged in short terraces behind small front gardens. The appeal property is a modest end of terrace and the garden to the rear is separated from the neighbour by a low fence which provides an open aspect to the space. The appeal relates to the erection of an out-building, described as a summerhouse, at the end of the garden. The building would measure 3.3m by 4.9m and would be around 2.5m in height with a flat roof.
4. The garden to the property is relatively small, with a significant proportion of the space occupied by a large conservatory which sits on the rear of the property. Due to its large size the proposed outbuilding, in combination with the existing conservatory, would occupy a large proportion of the remaining garden. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document - Residential Extension Guidelines (SPG) advises that in order to ensure adequate outdoor space for residents, the extent to which extensions lead to a loss of garden space should be taken into account in planning decisions. The guidance follows "Design for Life" guidance and advises that rear gardens should be at least the

size of the original dwelling. Policy SC5 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (Local Plan) also provides benchmark standards for external space in developments.

5. I noted on site that the conservatory on site occupied a significant proportion of the rear garden. Given the size of the proposed outbuilding, it would dominate the remaining space and leave little outdoor space for outdoor recreation. Given the size of the property, which appears to have 3 bedrooms, this would be inadequate to serve a family dwelling. The front garden to the property, which is small and open to public views from the street, would not serve as a usable alternative. Although the summerhouse could be used for recreation, and would partly replace smaller timber structures on site, it would nonetheless erode the usability of the rear garden, and so would diminish the quality of the living conditions of occupiers of the dwelling to a harmful extent. Furthermore, although I haven't been provided with an estimate of the size of the remaining garden space by either party, the submitted plans indicate that it would also fall short of that recommended in the policy and the SPG.
6. On the first matter I therefore conclude that the loss of amenity space that would arise from the proposal would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupants of the dwelling. Of the policies put to me I consider Policy SC5 to be most relevant. The proposal would conflict with the aim of this policy to secure development which meets the demands of everyday life of intended occupants by ensuring dwellings are served by adequate outdoor space, including access to a good sized private garden for family units. It would also conflict with guidance in the SPG and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which has similar aims.

Character and Appearance

7. The outbuilding would span the width of the plot and would occupy a large proportion of the remaining rear garden. Due to its height and depth it would also be visible above the existing boundary fence to No48 from adjoining gardens in the terrace, it would remain visible if a higher fence was erected, as shown on the proposed plans. Furthermore, it would be constructed in brick to match the main dwelling, and so would appear more substantial and permanent than the existing smaller timber structures currently on site. Together these factors would lead to an over-developed and cramped appearance to the garden, which would be at odds with the openness that characterises the adjoining plots.
8. On the second matter I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the character of the site and surrounding gardens and so would conflict with policies CC1 and CC2 of the Local Plan which together seek to maintain the character of the surrounding area and to secure development which functions well in itself and in its effect on surrounding areas. It would also fail to reflect the SPG which has similar aims, and the Framework, which seeks development which is sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

9. The proposal would fail to provide adequate living conditions for occupiers of the property and would harm the character and appearance of the area. There are no material factors which would outweigh this harm.

10. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Anne Jordan

INSPECTOR