



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2025

by K Lancaster BA (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/25/3365397

2A Cranmore Avenue, Isleworth, Hounslow TW7 4QW

- 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 Navdeep Grewal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/2712.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of double garage and creation of new build 4-bedroom house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal submission includes additional evidence which was not before the Council at the time of its decision. This includes amended plans reducing the size of the proposed dwelling from a four-bedroom dwelling to a three-bedroom dwelling. The Procedural Guide states that it is important that what is considered by the Inspector is essentially what was considered by the local planning authority, and on which interested people's views were sought.
3. I have considered this additional information taking into consideration the principles established by the Courts in *Holborn Studios Ltd*¹. In this case, the additional information provides further evidence in relation to the Council's reasons for refusal, rather than significant amendments to the proposal. For this reason, I consider that there would be no prejudice to any party, and I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of this additional information.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Osterley Park Conservation Area and whether it would preserve the setting of the Grade II Listed Buildings known as 133 and 135 Jersey Road;
 - The effect of the proposed development on highway safety, with particular regard to access and parking;

¹ *Holborn Studios Ltd v The Council of the London Borough of Hackney* [2017] EWHC 2823 (Admin)

- Whether the proposed development would provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers with particular regard to internal floorspace provision, daylight and sunlight and the provision of external amenity space; and
- Whether the proposal would meet carbon reduction standards.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site, 2a Cranmore Avenue (No.2a) comprises a substantial detached, two-storey, modern dwelling. It has a single storey detached, double garage, located close to the boundary with the neighbouring property 135 Jersey Road (No.135) which also has a single storey garage close its boundary.
6. Cranmore Avenue is predominantly residential, with mostly semi-detached dwellings and the occasional detached dwelling. They are mostly bay fronted with hipped roofs and constructed with red bricks to the lower elevations and white render to the upper floors, with red brick quoins. The design and appearance of No.2a follows some of these principles but is constructed predominantly of a yellow-coloured brick, with wide set gables. These features are at odds with the established character and appearance of Cranmore Avenue.
7. The appeal site is located within Osterley Park Conservation Area (the OPCA). The significance of the OPCA is derived primarily from Osterley House, its landscaped grounds and rural setting. The houses surrounding the perimeter of the park and to the south across the railway line are also important to the OPCA because they reflect the suburban character of their time built around the railway and later the Great West Road, and their integrity of roofs and architectural features, and quality of materials and design form the setting of the park.
8. The appeal site is located within Character Area 2: Parkside which is noted as being characterised by a ribbon of mostly large, individualistic two storey detached and semi-detached houses located on the southern edge of Osterley Park along Jersey Road. Paragraph 5.2.4 states that the low density, larger gardens and trees continue the open aspect, which makes the opportunity for and sight of trees, and gaps between roofs, of particular value.
9. The proposed development would involve the demolition of an existing single-storey garage and construction of a two-storey dwelling in its place. The dwelling would utilise similar materials to the existing neighbouring property, No.2a, which would not respond positively to the more established character of the area nor be in keeping with the wider conservation area.
10. Furthermore, by virtue of its scale, design and proximity to the boundary with No.135 it would appear as a visually obtrusive feature within the street scene, which in this part of Cranmore Avenue is characterised by spacious plots. This taken together with the substantial scale of the existing appeal property would erode this more spacious and low-density character which is found on Jersey Road and this part of Cranmore Avenue. Accordingly, it would not enhance the built form of the site or its surroundings.

11. Therefore, I find that it would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the OPCA, and I find that this would amount to less than substantial harm at the moderate end of the scale.
12. Turning to the setting of the nearby listed buildings, both 133 and 135 Jersey Road, are Grade II Listed Buildings. 133 Jersey Road² (No.133) is a C17th timber framed barn, which has been converted to a dwelling. Its significance is derived from its architectural and historic interest. No.135³ is a C17th brick-built building, with later additions and alterations which probably occurred in the C19th. Its significance is derived from its architectural and historic interest. These buildings also derive some of their significance from their setting.
13. Whilst I accept that some of their original setting has been eroded as a result of more recent alterations and additions, which includes the previous development of the appeal site, this does not justify further development which would cause harm. The existing single storey garage appears subservient in terms of its scale and better reflects the single storey elements to the rear of No.135, this relationship would be lost as a result of the proposed development and to the detriment of its setting.
14. In respect of No.133, although the appeal site shares a boundary with this property, there is a greater degree of separation and intervening development. Therefore, I find that the proposed development would preserve the setting of No.133. Nonetheless, for the reasons set out above, I find that the proposed development would fail to preserve the setting of a Grade II Listed Building, and I find that this would amount to less than substantial harm at the moderate end of the scale.
15. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, special regard shall be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. These are matters of considerable importance and weight.
16. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), the harm to the Conservation Area and the setting of a Grade II Listed Building should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The Framework advises that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification, and that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of the level of potential harm.
17. Paragraph 215 of the Framework states that where harm is identified to the significance of designated heritage assets and their setting, it should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
18. The public benefits of the proposed development include the provision of an additional dwelling on a small site that could be delivered relatively quickly, and which is located in a sustainable location. I attribute these benefits moderate

² List Entry Number: 1260846

³ List Entry Number: 1240786

weight. However, whilst the development may provide some public benefits, I am not persuaded that these, taken together, would be sufficient to outweigh the identified harm to the significance of the CA and setting of the listed building, given the great weight that must be given to their conservation.

19. For these reasons, I conclude that the development causes unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area and thus fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the OPCA and the setting of the nearby Grade II Listed Buildings. Thus, it would be contrary to Policies D3, D4 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021 and Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and GB7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 Volume One (the HBLP). Together, these policies seek to ensure developments complement the character of the area through high quality design and conserve and enhance the significance of the Borough's heritage assets.

Parking

20. Policy EC2 of the HBLP seeks to secure a more sustainable local travel network that maximises opportunities for walking, cycling and using public transport, reduces congestion, improves the public realm and improves health and well-being. It further states that this will be achieved by using the standards established in the London Plan for car parking, which specifies the maximum number of car parking spaces that developments should provide, having regard to the type of development and public transport accessibility.
21. Policy T6.1 of the London Plan 2021 states that new residential developments should not exceed the maximum parking standards set out in Table 10.3. The appeal site is located within an area with a PTAL Rating of 2, indicating poor access to public transport. In locations with a PTAL Rating of 2/3, Table 10.3 sets out a maximum parking standard of 1 space per dwelling, where the dwelling would provide three or more bedrooms.
22. The originally submitted plans showed that two parking spaces would be provided to the front of the proposed dwelling. This level of provision would exceed the maximum standards for parking provision as set out in the London Plan. However, a revised plan has been submitted with the appeal which reduces the parking provision to a single space. On this basis, the parking provision would not exceed the maximum standards set out in Table 10.3 of the London Plan and would therefore comply with Policy EC2 of the HBLP and Policy T6.1 of the London Plan in this regard.
23. The appeal site is located within a Controlled Parking Zone, with on-street parking bays located to the front of the appeal site. There is an existing vehicle crossover which provides access to the existing garage of 2a Cranmore Avenue. The front of the existing property is all hardstanding and provides parking for multiple vehicles. The proposed sub-division of the site would involve provision of an additional dropped kerb to serve 2a Cranmore Avenue, whilst the existing dropped kerb would be retained for use by the future occupiers of the proposed dwelling.
24. The London Borough of Hounslow Residential Crossover and Off-Street Parking Policy adopted October 2016 (the Parking Guidelines) states that for a single crossover there is a minimum width of 2.4 metres and a maximum width of 3.6 metres. For a double crossover, where there is hardstanding to accommodate two parked cars, then the vehicle crossover can be widened to a maximum of 4.2

metres. However, it further states that the width of the crossover must not exceed 50% of the width of the frontage of the property, must provide a 1.2-metre-wide pathway to the front door and be provided with a low wall across the remainder of the frontage.

25. The submitted plans show that a new crossover measuring approximately 4.5 metres in width would be provided for 2a Cranmore Avenue, which would also be provided with two parking spaces. This exceeds the maximum width of 4.2 metres as set out in the Parking Guidelines. Furthermore, the submitted plans do not include provision of a 1.2-metre-wide footpath to the front door for either property. Therefore, the parking provision would fail to accord with the guidance contained within the Parking Guidelines in this regard.
26. The Parking Guidelines also state that there must be no obstructions over 600mm high (including railings) along the front boundary. However, the submitted plans show front boundary walls and pillars, which are likely to exceed this measurement and therefore would fail to provide adequate visibility for the access, to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety.
27. Consequently, I therefore find that the proposed development would not exceed the maximum parking standards. However, the proposed crossover would exceed the maximum width set out in the Council's Parking Guidelines, which would result in harm to highway safety. Thus, it would be contrary to Policy T6.1 of the London Plan 2021 and Policy EC2 of the HBLP, which seek amongst other things, new development to avoid adverse impacts on the transport network and not prejudice highway or pedestrian safety.

Living Conditions – Future Occupiers

28. Policy SC5 of the HBLP requires provision of private external space that is usable and affords privacy and security with regard to the benchmark external space standards set out in Figure SC5.2. It states that for houses with five or more habitable rooms, a minimum of 75m² of external space should be provided.
29. The appellant states that the rear garden would measure approximately 50m², with further provision at the front of the property measuring 25m². However, not all of this would be usable external space, with much of the front garden taken up by a parking space, pedestrian access and bin/cycle storage. It would also not offer and privacy. Accordingly, it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would provide an appropriate amount of external space.
30. In respect of internal floorspace provision, the original scheme proposed a four-bedroom dwelling, with the fourth bedroom being located within the roof space. However, the revised scheme proposed a two-storey, 3 bedroom, 5-person dwelling with a total gross internal area of 109.6m². The proposed dwelling would provide two double occupancy bedrooms and a single bedroom measuring 7.6m². Overall, the proposed accommodation would exceed the minimum amount of floorspace required for a dwelling of this size.
31. In respect of daylight and sunlight, the Council's concerns relate to the provision of a fourth bedroom within the roof space, which would be served by three rooflights. However, the revised plans submitted with this appeal remove this bedroom. All other habitable rooms within the proposed dwelling would be served by good sized window openings, with the main living accommodation being dual aspect. The

Council raised no other concerns regarding the provision of daylight and sunlight or outlook. Based the evidence before me, I see no reason to disagree and therefore I conclude that the proposed dwelling would provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers, with particular regard to daylight and sunlight and outlook.

32. Consequently, whilst I have found that the proposed would provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers in respect of the internal floorspace provision and the provision of daylight, sunlight and outlook, it would not provide sufficient external amenity space. For these reasons, the proposed development would fail to provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers and thus be contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan and Policies SC4 and SC5 of the HBLP. These policies seek, amongst other things, seek to ensure development meet the needs of occupiers, does not compromise amenity and ensures suitable external space.

Carbon Reduction

33. Policy EQ1 of the HBLP requires all developments to meet the carbon reduction requirements set out in the London Plan. Policy SI2 of the London Plan requires residential development to achieve a minimum of a 10 per cent reduction through energy efficiency measures. It further states that where it is clearly demonstrated that the zero-carbon target cannot be fully achieved on-site, any shortfall should be provided, in agreement with the borough, either through a cash in lieu contribution to the borough's carbon offset fund, or off-site provided that an alternative proposal is identified, and delivery is certain.
34. The appeal is supported by an Energy Statement which sets out a range of carbon reduction measures which have been considered. These include use of an Air Source Heat Pump and solar panels. However, whilst I note the content of this document the proposed plans do not demonstrate how these measures would be incorporated into the proposed development.
35. Consequently, in the absence of detailed information to demonstrate compliance with the above policy requirements, I cannot be satisfied that the development would meet with the carbon reduction standards set out in Policy EQ1 of the HBLP and SI2 of the London Plan.

Other Matters

36. The appellant considers that the Council failed to take a positive and proactive approach to decision making. However, the Council's handling of the application is not a matter that I can consider under a Section 78 planning appeal and does not alter my findings, in which I have had regard solely to the planning merits of the proposal.

Conclusion

37. For the reasons set out above, the proposed development conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

K Lancaster

INSPECTOR