
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 June 2025

by **C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/25/3362062

Rear of 267-269 Vicarage Farm Road, Hounslow TW5 0DR

- 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 Risha Roda against the decision of the Council of The London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref. is P/2024/1796.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a detached two storey building to create a three bedroom house at the rear of 267 and 269 Vicarage Farm Road, fronting The Crossways with rear vehicular parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the local area;
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of 267 and 269 Vicarage Farm Road in respect of light and outlook;
 - the living conditions of future occupants of the development with regard to external amenity space;
 - highway safety; and
 - carbon emissions.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site relates to the rear amenity areas of a pair of two-storey, semi-detached dwellings on the junction of Vicarage Farm Road and The Crossways, in a largely residential neighbourhood. There is an alleyway along the eastern boundary that accesses detached garden outbuildings belonging to other houses in the vicinity. While there is no prevailing architectural style to residences in the street scene, which is characterised by properties of differing design, detailing and external materials, I observed that the layout of dwellings immediately to the east of the appeal site running along The Crossways in the direction of The Warren is fairly regimented. The front building lines of the units are laid out in a well-defined linear pattern along the highway; the distance between elevations and the road is therefore fairly consistent and uniform, and this arrangement is particularly noticeable at the junction with The Warren.

4. The proposal would include a two-storey front element that would interrupt this pattern, the layout plan demonstrates that it would project into the front garden of the appeal site and beyond the established building line that predominates along this side of The Crossways. Furthermore, it would be of significant proportions, with a ridge height exceeding those to either flank, thus exacerbating its dominance. It would be clearly evident from the public domain within the vicinity of the site resulting in a prominent incursion within the context of the locality.
5. I note the other examples in the area identified by the appellant, however the bungalow to the rear of 16 The Crossways is smaller than the appeal proposal and the two-storey house at the back of 11 The Crossways has been positioned to maintain the building line of other dwellings along West Way. As such these schemes are not comparable to the development before me.
6. I acknowledge that the proposal does not seek to replicate the design or style of surrounding properties, materials could be agreed by condition to ensure they are of high quality and there is the opportunity to replace a significant proportion of the hardstanding on the site with landscaping and planting, incorporated into domestic gardens. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
7. I therefore conclude that the scheme would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the local area. It would fail to comply with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC4 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (LP) and Policies D4 and D6 of the London Plan (LonP), which expect new development to be of a high-quality design that reflects and respects the existing setting and local context. Being in conflict with these policies in the Development Plan, the scheme would also contravene Policy SC1 of the LP, which holds a presumption against the development of self-contained homes within the curtilage of properties.

Living conditions – 267 and 269 Vicarage Farm Road

8. At its closest point, the flank wall of the new house would lie between 14-21 metres from the rear elevations of the host properties. I observed that this is a high-density, urban environment where such distances between built form are to be expected. Moreover, varying degrees of outlook from the rear elevations of 267 and 269 would still be retained in a broadly southeastern direction along The Crossways. With these matters in mind, I find that any enclosing effects would be only minimal, and no adverse loss of amenity would arise.
9. The new built arrangement between the appeal dwelling and the adjacent properties would cause some loss of light during the morning to the rear windows and gardens of nos. 267 and 269, however to my mind this would be limited and only for a brief time. As the day progresses the sun would pass round, and light to the host units would be as currently experienced. Consequently, I consider that the appeal scheme would not be so unneighbourly as to warrant a refusal of planning permission on this ground.
10. Accordingly, the scheme would not have a material effect upon the living conditions of the occupants of 267 and 269 Vicarage Farm Road in respect of light and outlook. It would be compatible with Policies CC2 and SC4 of the LP, which seek to ensure development does not materially harm amenity.

Living conditions – future occupants

11. The ground floor plan shows a front/side patio and lawn to serve the new dwelling; the Council has indicated that the primary section would be sub-standard in size. Moreover, this part of the garden would immediately abut both the public highway to the front and the alleyway to the side, which would reduce any perceived sense of privacy and security afforded and have a significantly limiting effect on the usability and function of the garden for family occupation. Overall, it is a hallmark of being an afterthought rather than carefully designed and well-integrated area.
12. I note the appellant's assertion that the bike storage could be relocated in place of some of the planting, still this would not counterbalance the harm I have outlined above.
13. I find that there would be an injurious impact upon the living conditions of future occupants of the development with regard to external amenity space. This would run contrary to Policy SC5 of the LP as far as it relates to the provision of areas that are usable and afford privacy and security.

Highway safety

14. I saw that the alleyway to the side of the appeal site provides access to numerous detached garden outbuildings belonging to other houses in the vicinity. It would appear to be of appropriate width for vehicular use, and the plans indicate that a parking space would be provided for the development towards the rear and via the alley.
15. I see no need for swept path drawings to make a judgement on this matter, to my mind the dimensions of the parking space and alley would be adequate for manoeuvring to occur without causing deleterious highway safety conditions or inconvenience to other road users. I have also borne in mind that manoeuvres would be at slow speed and infrequent in nature.
16. I conclude that the scheme would not give rise to concerns in relation to highway safety. It would meet with Policy EC2 by avoiding adverse impacts upon the transport network.

Carbon emissions

17. The Council have included a reason for refusal as the proposal has not demonstrated that opportunities to reduce carbon emissions have been maximised; I understand the Authority's wish to assess these matters at the application stage and what the relevant policies set out.
18. Whilst the appellant has suggested that this matter could be addressed by condition, no wording for such a condition has been provided. As a result, I am not satisfied that a condition would be precise, enforceable, or reasonable in all respects so as to address the Council's requirements. In the absence of such evidence, the proposal would fail to adhere to Policies EQ1 and EQ2 of the LP and Policy SI2 of the LonP, which require development to maximise energy savings at each step of the energy hierarchy.

Conclusion

19. Although the new dwelling would not have an undue effect upon the living conditions of the occupants of 267 and 269 Vicarage Farm Road and highway

safety, it would be detrimental to local character, the living conditions of future occupants with regard to external amenity space and in relation to carbon emissions. Having regard to this reasoning and all other issues, I dismiss the appeal.

C Hall

INSPECTOR