



---

## 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: 15<sup>th</sup> July 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/21/3281537**

**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 Smartway Connect against the decision of London Borough of Hounslow.
  - The application Ref 00631/62/P3, dated 18 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 June 2021.
  - The development proposed is described as 'Demolition the existing two storey dwelling and construct a new three storey block comprising a total of (6) six residential units (Class C3)'.
- 

### 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, c) the effects of the proposal on highway safety, and d) 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 south is a row of similar two-storey residential properties arranged in pairs.
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. Despite maintaining a similar ridge height to the adjoining property and accommodating the third floor of accommodation in its roof space, the replacement building has the appearance of a contemporary, three-storey apartment block. This is made apparent from its uncharacteristic twin projecting front gables and the balcony features along these.
7. The new apartment block would also occupy the full width of the plot and would be excessively deep and close to the footpath, compared to the existing property. As such, it would be appreciably dominant in views from the footpath.
8. Moreover, the new apartment block because of its design and scale would contrast starkly with the adjoining semi-detached property. As such, the proposal would be out of character and scale with nearby development, resulting in a conspicuous addition which would fail to assimilate with the prevailing arrangement of two storey, semi-detached properties.
9. Whilst there are examples of frontages dominated by hardstanding nearby, the combination of the scale of the proposed building and the removal of existing vegetation to facilitate the proposed car parking, would create a particularly built-up site with limited opportunities for landscaping to soften this.
10. There is development to the rear of the appeal site on Cottington Road, which varies in height from 2 to 4 storey dwellings, with small rear amenity spaces and concreted parking areas. Whilst this forms part of the character of the area, this is a planned estate which has a distinct form and arrangement and is different in layout, scale and appearance to the properties along Hounslow Road. Therefore, this does not lend support to the proposal.
11. For the above reasons and based on my findings on the second main issue, as set out below, I do not consider the proposal to be of high-quality design. Consequently, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. This would be contrary to 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, and liveable 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*

12. Bedroom 2 of Flat 1 would be served by two side windows facing the existing footpath. Both these windows would be partially opaque glazed, with top opening clear glass to the upper section of each window. This arrangement would allow for adequate privacy for future occupiers, as well as sunlight and daylight and good level of ventilation.
13. However, although views of the sky would be available, outlook from this bedroom would be restricted. Therefore, the proposed arrangement would

provide a particularly bleak aspect from bedroom 2 of Flat 1. There are also no strong policy or design reasons to accept lesser expectations with regard to outlook from bedrooms, which are also habitable rooms.

14. Flats 3 and Flat 5 are designed as 2-bed, 4 person units and would each provide about 69m<sup>2</sup> of floor space instead of the requirement of 70m<sup>2</sup>, in accordance with the Nationally Described Space Standards, which are expressed as minimums.
15. A single storey, 1-bed dwelling for two people would be required to provide a minimum of 50m<sup>2</sup> of floor space. Flats 4 and 6 would each provide only about 46.2m<sup>2</sup> of floor space.
16. Whilst some of the proposed flats meet the minimum floor space requirements and in general the proposed accommodation is dual aspect and provides open plan living areas with practical layouts, with required levels of sunlight/daylight, and amenity space. This is not sufficient justification for new development which, in part, fails to meet minimum space standards.
17. Consequently, the proposal would provide an unacceptable quality of accommodation for occupiers, contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan, 2021 (LP) which relates to housing quality and standards and requires that dwellings must provide at least the gross internal floor area based on minimum internal space standards for new dwellings. Further, that qualitative aspects of a development are key to ensuring successful sustainable housing, this includes optimising opportunities for visual interest through a range of immediate and longer range views. I also find conflict with Policy SC5 of the HLP, which amongst other things requires all developments to be of the highest quality internally and externally and meet the demands of everyday life for the intended occupants.

#### *Highway safety*

18. Five parking spaces would be provided along the site frontage. The proposed arrangement would create approximately 4m of clearance fronting the parking bays whereas the Council's requirement is 6m.
19. The submitted Transport Statement, includes drawings showing swept path analysis to demonstrate that a large car could enter the site, turn around within the frontage and egress back onto Hounslow Road in a forward gear. As the swept path analysis only demonstrates this for one of the more central parking spaces, I cannot be certain that the other parking spaces could also be utilised in a similar way. Nonetheless, I observed that some degree of reversing is takes place off the existing frontage and others nearby. Furthermore, this part of Hounslow Road largely serves a limited number of properties and on the information before me operates relatively safely. Therefore, the proposed arrangement is unlikely to significantly prejudice highway safety.
20. The pedestrian and cycle access between the parking spaces would be about 0.9m of width. This would be similar width to the proposed entrance doors and would not unduly obstruct pedestrians and cycle users accessing the building.
21. As such, the proposal would not result in any unacceptable harm to highway safety. Therefore, I find no material conflict with HLP Policy EC2, which relates to developing a sustainable local transport network.

### *Carbon offsetting*

22. 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.
23. Based on the proposed scheme a financial contribution of £6314 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 National Planning Policy Framework and Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (as amended).
24. The proposal therefore makes provision for carbon offsetting in accordance with LP Policy SI 2 and HLP Policy EQ1.

### **Other Matters**

25. The appellant has engaged in pre-application discussions with the Council and has also scaled down the extent of the initial proposal. Nonetheless, I have determined the scheme before me on its planning merits and have found this to be unacceptable.

### **Conclusion**

26. The submitted UU would make appropriate provision for carbon offsetting and the proposal does not generate any significant highway safety issues.
27. 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 and associated benefits, for which there is local and national policy support. However, this would be at the expense of the proposal harming the character and appearance of the area and failing to provide satisfactory living accommodation for its occupiers. For these reasons and conflict with the development plan, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*M Aqbal*

INSPECTOR