



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: 29 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/21/3282947

421 London Road, Isleworth, London TW7 5AQ

- 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 Flamur Zyberaj against the decision of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00707/421/P4, dated 7 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of a new dwelling house (2-bedroom) on side plot with associated landscaping, refuse provision, car and cycle parking provision.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Planning permission has been granted on appeal for a two storey side and single storey rear extension at the site¹. The side extension has not been built but the permission is a material consideration in this appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are (a) the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area in relation to its size, siting and design, (b) the adequacy of the proposed forecourt parking arrangements and (c) the sustainability of the proposal in relation to maximising carbon reductions.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal relates to a two storey end of terrace house at the junction with Langley Road. The house has been enlarged by a hip to gable roof alteration, a large rear dormer and a ground floor rear extension. The surrounding area is characterised by similar semi-detached and terraced houses with hipped roofs. There are higher buildings of flats on the opposite side of London Road.
5. The proposed house would be narrower than others in the terrace but wider than the consented side extension at about 0.35m from the side boundary as opposed to about 1.0m. It would be sympathetically designed in relation to inclusion of a 2-storey front bay with gable over and use of matching materials. But the gable end and full width rear box dormer, whilst matching the house, would depart from the predominant hipped roof form in the immediate locality.

¹ Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3187256 and application Ref 00707/421/P3

6. When viewed from the rear in Langley Road, the proposal's 3-storey massing would be close to the side footway and would dominate the appearance of the junction. It would contrast with the hipped roof to no. 419 London Road, set away from the side boundary on the other side of the road and with the majority of dwellings nearby retaining the more open hipped roofscape. Whilst the roof form would resemble that at no. 421, the existing structure is set away from the side boundary. In paragraph 11 of the appeal decision granting permission for the side extension, the Inspector commented, "*The distance of the extension from the boundary with Langley Road would ensure that this element of the extension would not be dominant or overbearing in the street scene*". By contrast, the current proposal would be dominant and overbearing in the street scene.
7. The development would thereby be contrary to Policies CC1, CC2 and SC4 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015-2030) (HLP) that support high quality urban design and architecture and a scale of development sympathetic to the site's context and character. Similarly, the proposal would not be compatible with Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021) on delivering good design but would satisfy the housing standards set in Policy D6.
8. The appellant has referred to several other local side extensions in support of the proposal. The extensions at 1 and 2 Langley Road are up to their side boundaries and that at no. 1 has a gable end, but both abut side passageways and are not prominent in the street scene. The extensions at 1 Roxborough Avenue and 29 Parkwood Road abut side footways but include hipped roofs to match roofs along these roads. The character of Wood Lane and some roads off it changes with some areas presenting hips and others where more tightly knit gable roof forms dominate. Each proposal has to be considered on its individual planning merits having regard to relevant planning policies in date at that time. The other cases referred to do not set a precedent for a proposal that would substantially compromise the present open character of the street scene on this prominent corner property.
9. Neither does the existence of the new higher flats development opposite the site justify the proposal. The new flats present a different but consistent character arising from redevelopment on a long frontage rather than a change to one plot within an established and substantially retained character area.
10. The guidance in the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines (2017) is to set a side extension on corner plots at least one metre in from the side boundary. Whilst this may not strictly apply to a proposal for a new house, the reasoning behind this relates to the impact of the development on the street's character and appearance; this reflects the purpose of the planning policies relevant to the current appeal.
11. The proposal would have the benefit of the provision of one additional dwelling of satisfactory size and layout in a sustainable location that would contribute to overall housing need. Policy H2 of the London Plan and Paragraph 69 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) recognise the contribution small sites can make to meeting housing requirements. But Policy H2 requires new homes to be "*well-designed*" and in my judgement the proposal would not be appropriate to its context. Paragraph 119 of the Framework encourages the effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, but this is whilst "*safeguarding and improving the environment*".

12. The Council confirms that it can currently demonstrate a five year housing land supply in relation to identified local housing need. The benefit of one additional home would not outweigh the harm arising to the character and appearance of the area. The pro-development clauses in Policy H2 do not supersede adopted policies in the HLP in relation to the character and appearance of the area.

Parking

13. The provision of 1 parking space would accord with London Plan Policy T6 for a 2-bedroom dwelling in a PTAL 3 location, but the proposed front garden parking space could not be used independently of the access at no. 421. The requirement to drive across a neighbour's forecourt could compromise the use of the retained space at no. 421. Furthermore, a car parked at no. 421 could obstruct access between the highway and the appeal site. The proposal would not be practicable and would be contrary to local and London wide policies promoting designs that function well including in relation to parking.
14. The appellant has offered to make the development car free but there is no information before me on the implications of this for on street parking stress. The proposal as submitted includes a frontage space which is not satisfactory.

Sustainability

15. Policy EQ1 of the HLP sets an expectation for all development proposals to meet the carbon emission reduction requirements set out in London Plan Policy SI2 whilst Policy EQ2 promotes the highest standards of sustainable design and construction in development to mitigate and adapt to climate change. The proposal includes insufficient detail for assurance that these policy requirements would be satisfied. Had the scheme been acceptable in other respects, I would have included sustainability conditions suggested by the Council in the event that the appeal is allowed.

Other Matters

16. I acknowledge that the appellant sought pre-application advice in accordance with recommended best practice and that an earlier version of the proposal showed a hipped roof to the house with no rear dormer. Notwithstanding the advice then issued by the Council, I am obliged to consider the proposal formally submitted in the appeal.

Conclusion

17. The development would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area in relation to its size, siting and design. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rory MacLeod

INSPECTOR