



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2024 by N Unwin BSc (hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by A Price BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/24/3340651

64 Dene Avenue, Hounslow TW3 3AH

- 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 Miss Sonya Khan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is 00345/64/P17.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of a two storey house with first floor rear projection, rear roof extension and associated cycle and refuse storage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. In the absence of a description of development within the application form, I have taken the description from the decision notice and used it within the banner heading.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area;
 - the provision of renewable energy;
 - the effect of the proposal on highway safety; and
 - surface water drainage.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site forms 64 Dene Avenue (no. 64), a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling on a corner plot. The surrounding area is primarily characterised by pairs of semi-detached, two-storey dwellings adjacent to, but set back from, the highway. This creates an open and spacious street scene. Whilst there is

variation in the design of these dwellings, with many having been altered or extended, their distinctive grouping in semi-detached pairs adds an agreeable repetition to the character of the area.

6. The appeal property has undergone extensive alterations to the rear. Nevertheless, the front elevation remains relatively unaltered, sharing a pleasing symmetry with the adjoining dwelling when viewed from Dene Avenue. The side elevation of the appeal dwelling is set back generously from the highway, contributing to the openness of the street scene. As such, the appeal property and associated grounds positively contribute to the character and appearance of the area.
7. The proposed two-storey dwelling would immediately adjoin no. 64, creating a terrace of three dwellings. This would unbalance the existing pair and harm the prevailing character of the area, which is defined by pairs of semi-detached dwellings. The proposal would utilise similar materials and design features as the adjoining dwelling, such as the two-storey bay window at the front elevation. Nevertheless, the width of the proposed dwelling would be noticeably narrower than that of the dwellings forming the adjoining pair, harming the existing attractive symmetry and appearing obtrusive within the street scene.
8. The proposal's intrusion into the open area between the side elevation of no. 64 and Bulstrode Gardens would harmfully erode the existing spaciousness of this section of the street, with the side elevation of the proposal appearing prominent and overbearing when viewed from the highway. Whilst the rear elevation of the proposal would be in keeping with the varied character of the rear elevations of the surrounding dwellings, this is a neutral factor and would not outweigh the identified harm to the character and appearance of the area.
9. Accordingly, the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area, conflicting with the relevant provisions of Policies CC1 and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (HLP, 2015) which, when read together, require new development to respond meaningfully and sensitively to the site, its characteristics and the layout of surrounding buildings, including particular features or qualities that contribute to an area's character.

Renewable Energy

10. Policy EQ1 of the HLP encourages developments to incorporate renewable energy and low carbon technologies, requiring all development to meet the carbon emission reduction requirements set out within the London Plan (LP, 2021). LP Policy SI2 requires minor residential development to achieve a 10% on site carbon reduction through energy efficiency measures.
11. The Energy Assessment submitted by the appellant demonstrates that Building Regulations Conservation of Fuel and Power Part L (2010) will be met through the use of energy efficient materials and heating systems. Furthermore, the document demonstrates that the proposal would achieve 30% carbon dioxide reduction through the implementation of Photovoltaic panels, beyond that required by LP Policy SI2.
12. LP Policy SI2 requires major development follow the energy hierarchy, maximising opportunities for renewable energy by producing, storing and using

renewable energy on-site. Nevertheless, given the proposal is not major development, this part of Policy SI2 is not applicable.

13. As such, the proposal would comply with the relevant provisions of LP Policies SI2 and SI3 and HLP Policies EQ1 and EQ2, which when read together, encourage developments to incorporate renewable energy and low carbon technologies, and require new minor residential development to achieve a 10% on site carbon reduction through energy efficiency measures.

Highway Safety

14. The appeal site is located within an area of relatively poor Public Transport Accessibility Level rating. Nevertheless, during my site visit I observed a large amount of unrestricted on-street parking within the area surrounding the appeal site. Moreover, an existing dropped kerb adjoins the site boundary with Dene Avenue with the submitted plans illustrating a paved area adjoining the front elevation of the proposed dwelling. This is capable of accommodating a single vehicle. The plans additionally show a proposed single parking space at the rear of the site onto Bulstrode Gardens, which benefits from an existing dropped kerb adjoining the highway. In the absence of any specific parking levels required by the Council on this site, I am of the view that the proposal would make sufficient provision for the parking requirements of the proposed dwelling.
15. For the above reasons, the development would ensure the adequate provision of parking for future occupiers in this particular instance and would not prejudice highway safety or traffic flows. Therefore, the development would accord with the relevant provisions of HLP Policy EC2 which, amongst other things, requires new development to provide for any increased parking demand.

Surface Water Drainage

16. The appeal site is located within Flood Zone 1 and as such has a low probability of river or sea flooding. The submitted plans show a soakaway located within the proposed modest rear garden area. Whilst drainage calculations have not been presented to me, given the size of the proposed rear garden I consider it likely that this area could contain a soakaway sufficiently capable of accommodating the proposal's surface water run-off. Furthermore, a detailed Surface Water Management Plan could be secured through condition should the appeal be allowed.
17. Accordingly, the proposal would comply with the relevant provisions of LP Policy SI13 and HLP Policy EQ3 which, amongst other things, require new development to incorporate sustainable drainage systems with the aim of achieving greenfield runoff rates.

Other Matters

18. I acknowledge that the proposal would contribute an additional single dwelling to housing supply in the borough and that it would make efficient use of a small site. However, the benefits in those respects would be limited by reason of the minor scale of the development. This has not led me to an alternative conclusion on the main issues.

19. I also note that the appeal property is not a listed building, is not located within a conservation area, and is not subject to any Article 4 Directions. However, these matters are neutral in my determination of the appeal.
20. The appellant has drawn my attention to several nearby developments, including at Dene Avenue and Bulstrude Avenue. While I only have limited information before me in respect of these developments, including their planning history, I acknowledge that there are some similarities, including the development to the side of established dwellings. However, they do not represent the prevailing character of the area and, in most cases, relate to subservient extensions to properties. This is in stark contrast with the circumstances at this site, which is for a new dwelling, built in line and sharing a ridge height with a neighbouring property in a highly prominent location. The case at 1 Dene Avenue relates to a larger housing development. For these reasons, the circumstances that applied to these other cases, and the planning balance there, are not directly comparable to those before me.

Conclusion and Recommendation

21. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, the proposed development would not accord with the development plan, when taken as a whole, and I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Unwin

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

22. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

A Price

INSPECTOR