



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 June 2022

by M Aqbal BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/22/3294843

62 Hounslow Road, Hanworth, TW13 6QH

- 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 Godil, Smartway Connect Limited against the decision of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00631/62/P4, dated 3 November 2021 was refused by notice dated 23 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is partial demolition of existing building to allocate a minor residential development of 5 flats in 3 storeys with car parking to front of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are a) The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; b) whether or not the proposal would deliver satisfactory living conditions for the occupiers of the development, and; c) whether or not the proposal makes appropriate provision for carbon offsetting.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached property along the eastern side of Hounslow Road. This property has been extended and subdivided to create two separate self-contained residential units. To the north of the site is a footpath, to the immediate south the adjoining semi-detached dwelling and beyond this is a row of similar two-storey semi-detached properties.
4. Some of the neighbouring properties have been extended with the addition of hip-to-gable and rear dormer extensions. Such extensions are not uncommon in the area and the extent of any increase in massing associated with these is not significant. In particular, when viewed from the highway, these properties generally retain the appearance of two-storey dwellings with some variance in roof forms. This, along with the similar arrangement of fenestration and spacing between the pairs of dwellings, provide a generally cohesive streetscene.
5. Although the host property incorporates a front gable and ridge line which steps down and is therefore different in appearance to the adjoining property, this is a design feature and reflects the appearance of the other end property along this row. Notwithstanding this, and despite incorporating extensions and alterations, the appeal property retains the overall appearance and scale of a two-storey dwelling and is therefore settled within the streetscene. Because the appeal

property occupies a corner plot adjacent to the footpath, it is prominent and particularly sensitive to change.

6. When viewed from the highway, the host property, as extended, would retain the projecting gable feature and its height would reflect the adjoining property. Also, the brick and render split as incorporated in the host property would be continued in the proposed design. The incorporation of a single front entrance would be an improvement on the existing arrangement, which incorporates two entrances at present.
7. Whilst the host property as extended would be wider than the adjoining semi-detached property, the former occupies a noticeably wider plot and a gap would be retained to the side of the host property. These factors, together with the space created to the side of the property by the existing footpath would absorb the additional width and scale of the proposal.
8. The ground floor extension would extend into the rear amenity space but would be largely screened by the existing boundary treatments to the site. The first floor would be a simple flat-roof design, which would not extend the full width of the property. The proposed dormer would be set in from the sides of the roof, setback from its eaves and would be lower than the new ridge height and therefore reflects the form of neighbouring dormer extensions. Furthermore, the designs and arrangement of the proposed windows and Juliet balconies along the rear elevation of the host property would mitigate any massing associated with the upper floor extensions and add interest to the rear elevation.
9. As such, the proposal would broadly reflect the character and appearance of the host property and while it would be of a larger scale than neighbouring properties, it would not be unacceptably disproportionate in the context of its plot. Overall, the property would retain the character and appearance of a dwelling, albeit one that has been extended.
10. For the above reasons, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would accord with Policies CC1 and CC2 of the Hounslow Borough Local Plan (2015-2030) (HLP). Together, these policies seek to promote and support high quality urban design and architecture to create attractive, distinctive places. Along with requiring development to maintain the character of an area and respond to any local architectural vernacular that contributes to an area's character.

Living conditions

11. Policy SC5 of the HLP is clear that flats should provide a combination of private outdoor space for every flat and communal open space. A minimum of 5sqm of private outdoor space should be provided for each 1 person dwelling and an extra 1sqm should be provided for each additional occupant of that dwelling. The requirements for private outdoor amenity space are also reflected in Policy D6 of the London Plan, 2021 (LP).
12. The proposed upper floor flats would not have access to any private amenity space.
13. Although communal amenity space would be provided, this would only be accessible through leaving the front door of the building and walking outside the property and along the side of the building to the rear of the site. This is not

considered to be a particularly practical or convenient arrangement and would greatly reduce the quality of this space for the occupants of the flats.

14. In any event, I do not believe that this would be a reasonable atonement for the failure to provide adequate private amenity space directly associated with some of the flats, in accordance with the above policies. Furthermore, the provision of flats which meet minimum floor space requirements with required levels of sunlight/daylight, are insufficient justification for failing to provide an important component of, such as private amenity space.
15. For the above reasons, the proposal would fail to provide an acceptable quality of accommodation for the occupiers of the development, contrary to Policy D6 of the LP and Policy SC5 of the HLP.

Carbon offsetting

16. In accordance with LP Policy SI 2 and HLP Policy EQ1, in relation to energy and carbon reduction, a carbon offset contribution is necessary, which is calculated in accordance with the Council's requirements.
17. Based on the proposed scheme a financial contribution of £6,272.00 index linked is required. The appellant's UU includes an obligation for this requirement. Therefore, the obligation in the submitted UU is necessary in order to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and reasonable in scale and kind. This accords with the tests that are set out in the Framework and Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (as amended).
18. The proposal therefore makes provision for carbon offsetting in accordance with LP Policy SI 2 and HLP Policy EQ1.

Other Matters

19. The appellant has engaged in pre-application discussions with the Council and has also scaled down the extent of that initial proposal. Furthermore, the scheme before me specifically responds to a previous refusal for a development comprising 6 flats at the appeal site. Nonetheless, I have determined the scheme before me on its planning merits and have found this to be unacceptable.

Conclusion

20. The proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area and the submitted UU would make appropriate provision for carbon offsetting.
21. I also acknowledge that the proposal would make efficient use of a site in a constrained area in a sustainable location to deliver new and additional housing, which would directly contribute to housing delivery with associated benefits, for which there is local and national policy support. However, this would be at the expense of the proposal failing to provide satisfactory living accommodation for its occupiers. For this reason and conflict with the development plan, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Aqbal

INSPECTOR