



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 July 2024

by Katie McDonald MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/24/3337055

123 Hibernia Road, Hounslow TW3 3RL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by M's F Idris against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is 00603/R/O123/P1.
 - The development proposed is the change of use from storage to self contained single family dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Amended plans showing a different ground floor layout were submitted with the appellant's final comments. These were not the plans the Council made their decision upon, and I have not considered them in this decision.

Main Issue

3. This is whether the proposal would provide suitable living conditions for future and existing occupiers.

Reasons

Living conditions of future occupiers

4. The site is a single storey detached outbuilding to the rear of 123 Hibernia Road. It is currently used as storage. The proposal is to change the use of the building to a one bedroom dwelling.
5. Owing to the configuration of the plot, future occupiers would have no access to any rear amenity space. However, there is a small strip of space to the front and sides of the dwelling, and as the site is enclosed by tall boundary treatments on all sides, this would be private.
6. Nevertheless, these areas would not provide sufficient space to serve the needs of future residents, with Policy SC5 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (September 2015) (LP) requiring that for dwellings with up to 3 habitable rooms, no less than 50 square metres of usable amenity space is needed. Whilst flatted developments may be served by less space, these have different policy requirements to that of houses, as detailed in Policy SC5. The strip to the front would also be north facing, elongated and narrow, such that it would not provide a suitable shape, aspect or useable external space.

7. Given the tall surrounding boundary treatments close to the windows of the dwelling, the outlook from all habitable rooms would be compromised. Most windows face north and are single aspect, which Policy CC2 seeks to avoid. The kitchen would be served by no windows, which would result in an oppressive internal environment. Additionally, the bedroom window on the side would be served by patio doors that face a solid boundary treatment within one metre. The outlook from this bedroom would be extremely poor and unacceptably overbearing, leading to an intolerable sense of enclosure for the future occupiers. However, given the proximity to the boundary treatment, and the location of windows in No 123, it would not result in any loss of privacy from overlooking neighbouring properties.
8. Consequently, the proposal would fail to provide suitable living conditions for future occupiers, with specific regard to outdoor amenity space and outlook. This is contrary to Policies SC1, CC2, SC5 and SC7 of the LP, which seek to promote sustainable housing growth, with suitable external space that minimises harm to future occupants. However, there would be no conflict with CC1 of the LP in relation to this main issue, which seeks to take opportunities to enhance the context and character of the area. There would also be no conflict with the Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (REG SPD).

Living conditions of existing occupiers

9. The proposal would be close to neighbouring dwellings at Nos 121 and 123, along with 150 Grove Road. However, the use of the building as a residential dwelling for up to 2 people is unlikely to lead to unacceptable increases in noise and disturbance. It is a predominantly residential area and there is very little external space for future occupiers to spend time outside in any event.
10. Thus, the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the living conditions of existing occupiers, compliant with Policies CC2 and SC7 of the LP. These seek to ensure proposals have a positive impact on the amenity of current and future residents and minimise harm to neighbouring residents. There would also be no conflict with the REG SPD.

Conclusion

11. The proposal would have an acceptable impact on the living conditions of existing occupiers. However, it would not provide suitable living conditions for future residents, and thus the benefits of providing additional housing would be reduced by the failure to provide suitable accommodation.
12. There are no other reasons that lead me to conclude a decision other than in accordance with the development plan, and for the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

Katie McDonald

INSPECTOR