The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2020

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/20/3246839
48 Marnell Way, Hounslow TW4 7LY

- 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 H Sekhon against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
- The application Ref 00742/48/P5, dated 29 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2020.
- The development proposed is described as subdivide the existing plot into 3 independent plots. Retain the existing house, propose 2 new bungalows to land to the rear with onsite parking and amenity space.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposal has been altered from the application form to the decision notice. Although the Council's description has brevity, I do not consider that it fully describes the proposal before me, and I have no evidence that the change in description has been agreed with the appellant. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of the original description.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site contains a two-storey semi-detached house with an unusually large L-shaped, now divided off, rear garden which extends beyond the rear of the neighbouring semi-detached property, 46 Marnell Way. The land appears to have been formed by the amalgamation of neighbouring garden space in the past. The site is accessed via an alleyway which links Marnell Way and Beavers Lane. The character of the area is residential. Detached outbuildings, generally of limited height and footprints which are not excessive in size in relation to their plots are common features to the rear of nearby dwellings.

5. The building proposed would be large in footprint with a design rationale that appears to prioritise the maximisation of floor space within the plot over all other factors. It would be positioned tightly against the southern boundary of

the site and would only be set a very short distance back from the northern boundary.

6. Despite the provision of some parking and manoeuvring space to the front and garden space to the remainder of the plot to the rear, the building would dominate the site in a manner in which other outbuildings to the rear of properties nearby do not, and as a result it would fail to sit comfortably within the plot.

7. Despite the building being of single storey design, it would have a bulky form and appearance, partly as a result of its boxy roof form and the not insubstantial total building height proposed. These factors, combined with the significant footprint of the proposal would afford the building a degree of prominence which would not be reflective of the degree of subservience required to suit its secondary, backland location.

8. The evidence indicates that there are two extant approvals at the site which relate to different schemes, both relating to the provision of one single storey dwelling. However, both schemes, including that which was the subject of a successful appeal (Ref: APP/F5540/W/19/3228934) appear to relate to much more restrained proposals.

9. The dwellings associated with both schemes are partially proposed on the same part of the site and therefore only one could be implemented. It therefore follows that the existence of these approvals does not serve to justify the provision of two dwellings on the site.

10. I acknowledge that the proposal provides acceptable levels of internal and external space, but this is a neutral factor. I conclude that the proposal by reason of its size, position and design would result in an incongruous and conspicuous development which would amount to overdevelopment of the plot in a manner which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

11. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies CC1 and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015-2030) which amongst other things seek to secure development that sensitively and creatively responds to an area's character and require development proposals which respond meaningfully and sensitively to the site, its characteristics and constraints and the layout, grain, massing and height of surrounding buildings. It would also conflict with the Housing SPG[1] which shares similar aims. Further, the proposal would not meet with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to promote good quality design.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons above, having considered all relevant matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR

[1] Mayor of London Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance 2016.