



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 March 2022

by Rory MacLeod BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/21/3287551

3 Spur Road, Isleworth, TW7 5BD

- 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 Ishaque Khan against the decision of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref P/2021/3458, dated 19 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is a shed on the roof to store dry goods.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposal is to retain a development that has already taken place.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the development's effect on the character and appearance of the host building and wider street scene in relation to its size and design.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to Bayleaves Tandoori, a takeaway business within a single storey shop unit. It is one of four such units at the junction of London Road with Spur Road that have a tapering shape, narrowing to the rear, that infill on a curve between adjacent two storey buildings with rooms in the roof. The four single storey units have a flat roof concealed from street level by a parapet wall the top of which aligns with the first floor window sill to no.5 Spur Road.
5. The shed has been constructed on the flat roof to the shop unit. It is made of timber and has a flat roof. Its entrance door at the rear faces five steps down to a lower flat roof. Access is gained via a covered staircase at the rear of the shop unit. The shed is sited away from the flank wall to 5 Spur Road and set back from the front parapet wall by about 0.8m.
6. The parapet wall hides the lower part of the shed in street views, but its upper parts are clearly visible. The shed has been painted white which matches the white painting of the parapet's outer face at the appeal site. Nonetheless, the rectangular form of the shed appears as a curious and incongruous skyline feature in direct views from the opposite side of Spur Road. In views from the north along Spur Road, the shed can be seen beyond the adjacent 2-storey wall due to its forward siting on the flat roof.

7. The shed is less conspicuous when viewed from the southern side of London Road as it is set away from the parapet walls framing 154-156 London Road and 1 Spur Road. Its flat roof at the same height to the eaves to the hipped roof at 5 Spur Road does not obstruct views of the dormer on the hip.
8. But in closer views from the east and south-east the shed is more prominent. Its box-like form dominates the host building due to its forward siting close to the parapet wall. The shed's siting, size and design also detracts from the appearance of the four single storey shop units on this open corner site.
9. The development thereby is contrary to Policies CC1 and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015-2030) that support high quality urban design and architecture that is sympathetic to the site's context and character.
10. I acknowledge that the business operates in relatively cramped conditions with little space for storage of food products. The shop unit has a frontage of conventional width, but the site's tapering shape constrains space for the cooking area and the scope for storage at ground floor level.
11. Paragraph 81 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that planning decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. But this has to be balanced by the Framework's other objectives. Paragraph 130 requires developments to function well, adding to the overall quality of the area, to be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and to be sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment.

Conclusion

12. The shed has a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host building and wider street scene in relation to its siting, size and design. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rory MacLeod

INSPECTOR