



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 15 November 2021

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/21/3274281

57 and 59 Kingsbridge Road, Southall, UB2 5RU

- 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 Bachittar Singh & Ms RK Saggi against the decision of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00665/57-59/P3, dated 10 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of a two-storey house to replace garages at the rear of 57-59 Kingsbridge Road
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the application form removing elements that are not acts of development. Although different to the decision notice, no confirmation that a change was agreed has been provided.

Main Issue

3. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. There is a staggered building line in parts of Barnes Avenue. However, this is primarily where the path of the road curves and the properties themselves are orientated to face directly onto the street. Generally, where there is a stagger, the adjacent properties follow a similar angle. Properties are also set back from the road behind frontage parking. This creates a flow to the streetscene and gives it a spaciousness.
5. The proposed dwelling would be at an angle to the street along a mostly straight section of road. While the porch is the opposite side of the dwelling from 1 Barnes Avenue, the difference in the building line would be far more pronounced than the more modest stagger between the nearest pairs of properties on this side of the road.
6. In addition, while there is frontage parking, the corner of the proposed dwelling would be noticeably further forward of the adjacent pair of properties and 57 Kingsbridge Road. As a result, the incompatible slant of the proposed building line would be obvious in the streetscene.

7. The existing garage is of a similar footprint, position and orientation. Nevertheless, being single storey with a shallow sloping roof and set back behind the adjacent boundary treatments, the garage is a relatively discrete presence in the street. The proposed dwelling would be closer to the road, protrude beyond the existing side boundary treatment and be 2 storeys.
8. The incongruity of the forward and angled position of the appeal property would disrupt the rhythm of properties. Moreover, it would be prominent along this part of Barnes Avenue and would erode the sense of spaciousness in the street.
9. There is some variation in the appearance and scale of properties nearby. The proposed dwelling would include design features such as a lean to ground floor element, pitched main roof and dormer breaking the eaves that reflect the properties in Barnes Avenue. Furthermore, were the appeal to be allowed a condition could be imposed to ensure matching materials. Consequently, the dwelling itself would not be discordant with the surrounding area.
10. Notwithstanding this, the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. The scheme would fail to accord with Policies CC1 and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan Volume One where they seek to ensure proposals respond to the local vernacular and their wider context and create attractive places.

Other Matters

11. In the previous appeal scheme the proposed property was set back further from the road, almost in line with the adjacent pair of properties and orientated more directly towards the road. Therefore, it is materially different to, and would not result in the same harm, as the scheme before me.
12. The contribution towards housing supply as well as economic and social benefits associated with the occupation and build of the property would be small.
13. A lack of refusal reasons relating to matters such as internal space, energy efficiency, highway safety, parking or living conditions of nearby properties is a neutral factor and does not weigh in favour of the scheme. As I have found sufficient harm to dismiss the appeal on other grounds, there is no need for me to consider these matters further.

Conclusion

14. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
15. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR