



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 7 June 2021

by Alexander O'Doherty LLB (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/21/3269470

40 Sherborne Road, Feltham TW14 8ES

- 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 Sukhvinder Singh Dhaliwal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01013/40/P1, dated 7 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as, "Erection of new house on land adjacent to 40 Sherborne Road with rear parking for the host property and roof alterations to 40 Sherborne Road".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. During the course of the appeal The London Plan was published¹, which replaced all previous versions. The parties were provided with an opportunity to comment on its relevance to this appeal, and I have taken the comments received into account in my determination of this appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and the effect of the proposal with respect to highway safety and sustainable transport.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site comprises a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling located on a prominent corner plot in a residential area. This part of Sherborne Road contains a large number of semi-detached properties, as does much of Cedar Road. The front and side garden at the site provides an air of openness, and this is mirrored at several other corner plots in the vicinity. These garden areas serve to reduce the perception of the mass of built form in the vicinity. As such, they are a notable component of the pattern of development in the local area, as are the preponderance of semi-detached properties nearby.
5. The proposal would sub-divide the existing plot and would create a new 2-storey dwelling, which would be attached to the side of No 40 Sherborne Road

¹ The London Plan (published 2021)

- (No 40). Due to its architectural design and matching materials, the new dwelling would broadly compliment No 40 and the existing semi-detached pair. However, the proposal would in effect create a new terrace in a prominent location which would be significantly at odds with the predominant pattern of development in the surrounding area.
6. Furthermore, the new dwelling would extend close to the site's side boundary and a parking space would be created at the front of the site, which would, in combination, severely reduce the sense of openness referred to above. Additionally, the new dwelling would present a large and chiefly blank elevation facing towards Cedar Road, which would reduce the attractiveness of that street. As a result, the established character and appearance of the area would be materially harmed.
7. I therefore find that the proposal would have an unacceptable and harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would conflict with Policies CC1 and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 – 2030: Volume One (adopted 2015) (Local Plan) which collectively provide that, amongst other things, development proposals should respond to the wider context of the area and its urban structure. It would also conflict with Policy D3 of The London Plan which provides that, amongst other things, development proposals should enhance local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness.

Highway safety & sustainable transport

8. The appeal site has an existing vehicular access and a crossover onto Cedar Road. This access would continue to serve the existing dwelling. The proposal would create one new car parking space, to the front of the site, with access also to be achieved from Cedar Road.
9. I have taken careful account of the Transport Statement submitted by the appellant, including the drawings showing vehicle tracking / swept-path analysis and visibility splays. However, the exact dimensions of the proposed vehicular crossover have not been provided. As such, the proposal has not demonstrated compliance with the minimum requirements for a crossover, as set out in the Residential Crossovers and Off-Street Parking Policy (2016). As the size of the area of footway that vehicles could traverse is not known, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would enable pedestrians to move to a safe place and be clear of vehicles coming and going from the appeal site. Hence, it is not possible to confirm that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on highway safety, including the safety of pedestrians.
10. Moreover, although the plans show a secured cycle stand, this would not be fully enclosed or sheltered, according to the proposed ground floor plan. Additionally, no hard-surfaced path to it is shown on the plans. The primary access point to the cycle stand would be through a side gate. The Council have stated that the gate would not meet its width requirements, and this matter has not been disputed by the appellant. Thus, I can only conclude that the proposal would be deficient with respect to the incorporation of design measures and facilities to promote cycling.
11. I therefore find that it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on highway safety, and furthermore, based on the evidence before me, I find that the proposal would not make adequate

provision for sustainable transport options. Thus, the proposal would conflict with Policy EC2 of the Local Plan which requires proposals for vehicle crossovers to be consistent with the Council's adopted policy on vehicle crossovers, and which provides that, amongst other things, development proposals should incorporate design measures and facilities to promote cycling. Based on the evidence before me, the proposal would not comply with the Residential Crossovers and Off-Street Parking Policy (2016) which sets out the minimum requirements for a crossover.

12. The proposal would also conflict with Policy T5 of The London Plan which provides that, amongst other things, development proposals should help remove barriers to cycling and create a healthy environment in which people choose to cycle.

Other Matters

13. The Council did not refuse the application on residential amenity grounds, nor with respect to the living conditions of the intended future occupiers of the proposal. However, these are neutral matters, which do not weigh in favour of the proposal.
14. The proposal would contribute to both the local housing stock and to the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, via the creation of one new dwelling in an urban area. However, due to the quantum involved, this contribution would be limited. The submitted Energy Statement confirms that the proposal would provide for a high level of sustainability in its design, and I note that PV panels would be installed. I have also taken account of the appellant's assessment of the proposal against the Lifetime Homes Standard. Whilst all these matters, taken in combination, have been afforded moderate weight, in my view they are not sufficient to outweigh the considerable planning harm identified on the main issues.
15. Therefore, I find that the matters advanced in support of the proposal, do not, either individually or collectively, outweigh the harm identified, nor the conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alexander O'Doherty

INSPECTOR