
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2020

by C Osgathorp BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/20/3251826

54 Wellington Road North, Hounslow TW4 7AE

- 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 M Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01180/54/P3, dated 23 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single-storey rear extension, erection of a rear dormer roof extension and conversion of the roof space into habitable accommodation to facilitate conversion of a dwelling-house to two (2x) self-contained flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr M Patel against the Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - Whether the building is suitable for subdivision having regard to local housing needs; and,
 - Whether the proposed development would make suitable provision for refuse, recycling and cycle storage; and,
 - Whether the proposed development would make an adequate contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions.

Reasons

Housing needs

4. The proposal would involve the subdivision of an existing 2-bedroom small family house into 2no 1-bedroom flats. Policy SC6 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (the Local Plan) provides a set of criteria in relation to the subdivision of existing housing. It states, amongst other things, that development proposals will be expected to: have a minimum 130sqm net original internal floor area to be considered suitable for subdivision; and, provide at least one family-sized unit at ground floor, except in locations not

considered suitable for families. The Policy defines a family-sized unit as having two bedrooms – four person or more.

5. It is not disputed that the original internal floor area of the appeal building is less than 130sqm. This would remain the case even as a result of the proposed extensions. Furthermore, whilst the floor areas of the proposed flats would meet the minimum space standards set out in the Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard for 1-bedroom dwellings, the proposal would not provide a unit on the ground floor that is suitable for family accommodation. There is no substantive evidence before me to suggest that the appeal site is in a location that is not suitable for families. The proposal would therefore be harmful to the supply of family housing.
6. For these reasons, I conclude that the building is not suitable for subdivision. The proposal would be contrary to Policy SC6 of the Local Plan, which, amongst other things, seeks to manage the subdivision of existing housing stock to contribute to housing supply and secure the provision of family-sized housing.

Storage facilities

7. The appeal property is within a terrace which is set behind small front gardens. The front gardens are generally enclosed by low boundary walls and I saw that the gardens accommodate a small number of bins for each property.
8. Whilst no details of the required refuse and recycling capacity for the proposed development are before me, it seems to me that there would be a need for additional bins due to the proposed increase in dwelling units. Furthermore, cycle storage facilities are required in order to encourage the use of sustainable transport and reduce car use.
9. The proposal includes no details of the siting, size or design of refuse, recycling and cycle storage facilities. Given that there is no external access to the rear garden, it would only be practical for storage facilities to be provided in the front garden. In this respect, the appellant states that the size of the front garden could accommodate the required cycle and refuse storage facilities. Be that as it may, the storage of additional bins and cycles in the front garden would be likely to cause clutter that would be detrimental to the appearance of the front of the building and the street scene. On the basis of the limited information before me, I am not satisfied that my concerns could be overcome through the imposition of a planning condition to require the approval of further details.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would fail to make suitable provision for refuse, recycling and cycle storage. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies CC1, EC2, EQ7 and SC6 of the Local Plan, which, amongst other things, requires development proposals to incorporate design measures and facilities to promote cycling; be of a high quality design and include provision for the storage of waste and recycling; and, ensure that there is no undue loss of amenity for the surrounding area.

Carbon Dioxide Emissions

11. Policy EQ1 of the Local Plan requires that all developments meet the carbon emission reduction requirements set out in the London Plan. Policy 5.2 (C) of the London Plan requires major development proposals to include a detailed energy assessment to demonstrate how the targets for carbon dioxide

emissions reduction are to be met. This requirement is not applicable to the appeal scheme because it is not a major development.

12. Policy 5.2 (A) of the London Plan sets out that development proposals should make the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions. The appellant's Energy Statement¹ sets out measures to achieve reductions in carbon emissions, and details of a final scheme could be secured by a planning condition.
13. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would make an adequate contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions. The proposal would therefore accord with Policy EQ1 of the Local Plan and Policy 5.2 of the London Plan, which seek to minimise the demand for energy and promote renewable and low carbon technologies.

Other Matters

14. The appellant has drawn my attention to an appeal decision at 37 Kingsley Road² and he asserts that this scheme did not comply with the 130sqm requirement of Policy SC6. Nevertheless, I am not aware of the evidence that was before the Inspector for that appeal scheme. In this regard, I note that Policy SC6 of the Local Plan is not referred to in the appeal decision and no conclusion was made in relation to that Policy. Consequently, that appeal decision is not directly comparable to the matters before me.
15. Furthermore, I acknowledge that the Council granted planning permission for a conversion at 25 Kingsley Road³. Nevertheless, I have determined the appeal scheme on its own merits and I am not bound by decisions made by the Council.
16. The contribution provided by one additional dwelling unit towards local housing supply would be limited and would not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Osgathorp

INSPECTOR

¹ Prepared by gc planning dated February 2020.

² Appeal reference: 3213008 for the change of use of a two bedroom dwelling to a travel agent office and a 1 bedroom flat.

³ Council's reference: 00667/25/P3 for change of use from single family house to financial & professional services office and creation of a self-contained flat