



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2022

by B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/22/3298937

117 Jersey Road, Isleworth TW7 4QR

- 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 Adel A Salama against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00647/117/P7, dated 14 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Conversion and extension of existing outbuilding to Proposed 1 bedroom (2person) Ground Floor detached bungalow. With refuse store and secure cycle cage (2no's).'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are:
 - the principle of development in a rear garden location;
 - the effect that the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the surrounding area;
 - whether the proposal provides adequate living conditions for future occupiers, with respect to the provision of light and cross ventilation;
 - whether the proposal would provide appropriate facilities for cycle parking;
 - whether the proposal would provide appropriate facilities for bin storage; and
 - whether the proposal would meet sustainability and carbon reduction requirements.

Reasons

Principle of Development

3. Policy SC1 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 Volume One (LP) seeks to maximise the supply of housing in the borough to meet housing need in a manner that is consistent with sustainable development principles. However, notwithstanding this, it sets out that the Council will maintain '*a presumption against the development of self-contained residential units within the curtilage of existing dwellings where the proposal would be in conflict with other policies in this plan*'.

4. As such, in order to assess whether or not the proposed development would comply with this it is first necessary to consider its effect on the other issues raised by the Council as set out above.

Character and Appearance

5. Surrounding the appeal site, Jersey Road is characterised by large two storey semi-detached properties, set back from the highway, with off street parking to the front. The pitched or gable roofed properties have generous rear gardens, and a number of single storey rear outbuildings are evident. As such, there is a uniform and spacious character to the surroundings.
6. The proposal would convert and extend the existing outbuilding sited at the rear of the garden of No 117 into a separate independent dwelling. The dwelling would be accessible through a rear lane, which provides access to a row of garages and there would remain garden sizes comparable to neighbouring dwellings, for example No 121.
7. The existing outbuilding is limited in its visual impact, and the extension would not greatly increase its prominence. However, a new independent dwelling in this location would represent development at odds with the general linear pattern of highway fronting dwellings along Jersey Road and the surroundings. It would not reflect the form or grain of existing development and so would harm the established character of the surroundings. Moreover, the dwelling would retain the appearance of a single storey outbuilding, incongruously contrasting with the surrounding consistent two storey dwellings.
8. The appellant points to recent development on Penwerris Avenue, to the rear of No 121 Jersey Road. These dwellings, whilst sited to the rear of No 121, face the highway and their two storey, gable roofed semi-detached form sit comfortably within the surrounding street character. As such, they are not comparable to the scheme before me. The appellant also points to similar development at 65 Sutton Road. The drawings provided show that whilst the dwelling would sit next to garages, it would face onto Sark Close and a dwelling directly opposite. As such, it would sit within the street scene, not as part of a rear lane. Again therefore, this development is not comparable in this respect to the proposed development.
9. I conclude that the development would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with the requirements of LP Policies CC1, CC2 and SC4, which along with London Plan (LDP) Policy D4, require development to respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area. Given that I have found conflict with these policies, there is also therefore conflict with LP Policy SC1.

Living Conditions

10. The property would have windows mainly facing the garden area on its northern elevation; however, an eastern side elevation window would also serve the kitchen. In addition, a narrow window would be sited next to the doorway into the living/kitchen dining area on the southern elevation. There would therefore be more than one aspect and cross ventilation would be provided.
11. Whilst facing a northern direction, given the scale of the main fenestration serving the habitable rooms and the separation distance between the frontage

of the property and the rear of the host dwelling, I am satisfied that the dwelling would be provided with adequate levels of sunlight and daylight.

12. As such, I find that the proposal would provide adequate living conditions for the intended future occupiers of the scheme. I therefore find that there is no conflict with LP Policy SC5 and LDP Policy D6, which require that, amongst other things, proposals be of the highest quality internally.

Cycle Storage

13. The submitted plans show that 2 cycle parking spaces would be provided near to the bin store and entrance, in accordance with the requirements of LDP Policy T5. However, the plans lack detail in how this space would be accessed or how the cycles would be secured.
14. As such, a condition would be necessary requiring full details of the cycle spaces, to allow the Council to ensure the details are appropriate and retainable, and in accordance with LDP Policy T5, that the spaces are designed and laid out to comply with the guidance contained in the London Cycling Design Standards.
15. Subject to this condition, there is no conflict therefore with the sustainable travel goals of LP Policy EC2 and LDP Policy T5.

Bin Storage

16. The plans show a bin storage area sited next to the entrance to the property from the rear lane. Given this location, there would be easy access Penwerris Avenue, and whilst this would involve carrying bins to the pavement side, LP Policy EQ7 does not specify a maximum distance and I do not consider the distance excessive.
17. The plans do not however include detail regarding the size and design of the waste and recycling facilities, as required by LP Policy EQ7, and a condition to require further details in this regard would be appropriate.
18. Subject to this, I find no conflict with the sustainable waste management goals of LP Policy EQ7.

Sustainability Requirements

19. LP Policy EQ1 requires that all developments meet the carbon emission reduction requirements set out in the London Plan. The overall approach is to secure carbon reductions where development comes forward and to encourage developments to utilise renewable and low carbon technologies. In addition, LP Policy EQ2 promotes the highest sustainable design and construction standards to mitigate and adapt to climate change.
20. The appellant has provided an Energy Assessment¹, and this sets out that it is possible for the development to incorporate measures to secure carbon reductions and sustainability measures. In order to secure these measures, I find that further details of this nature could, if required, be secured by condition. In addition, as suggested by the wording of LDP Policy SI5, further details can be secured through a condition to secure appropriate water consumption.

¹ Energy Assessment, 117 Jersey Road, by Fenton Energy (19th Jan 2022)

21. LDP Policy SI2 requires a minimum off-site reduction of at least 35% beyond Building Regulations, however this relates to major development. The policy also requires major development to be net zero-carbon, and that where it is clear that this cannot be fully secured on-site, a cash in lieu contribution to the borough's carbon offset fund be provided. Given the scale of the proposed development, this policy requirement is not applicable in this instance.
22. Subject to the above conditions, I therefore find no conflict with the sustainable design and construction and carbon reduction goals of LP Policies EQ1 and EQ2, and the water infrastructure goals of LDP Policy SI5.

Other Matters

23. The development would result in a small economic benefit during construction and a small, sustained benefit to the local economy once occupied. It would contribute to boosting the supply of housing and partly utilise an existing building. However, the provision of a single additional dwelling would be a limited social benefit attracting limited weight in favour of the scheme.
24. Therefore, overall, the benefits of the development attract limited weight in favour of the scheme, which do not outweigh the harm identified to character and appearance and therefore the principle of development in this rear garden location, which are matters that attract significant weight against the scheme.

Conclusion

25. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Phillips

INSPECTOR