
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2025

by **C Skelly BA (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/25/3365646

27 Riverdale Rd, Feltham, TW13 6NR

- 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 Pyrosome Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/4351.
 - The development proposed is construction of two storey, three-bedroom new side attached dwellinghouse, with provision of refuse/cycle storage, and amenity space; incorporating host dwelling PV panels installation to front roof, entrance door style and front garden with boundary treatment changes.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant has confirmed that as part of the appeal incorrect plans were uploaded in error. However, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the same plans which were considered by the Council in the determination of the planning application.
3. It is common ground that following an extensive fire, 27 Riverdale Road was effectively demolished. Under Section 55 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) the rebuilding of the house is development for which planning permission would be required.
4. I note that the parties dispute whether it was before or after demolition that planning permission was granted for extensions to the dwelling. I also note that a replacement dwelling that appears to be in keeping with the submitted plans is under construction on the site of No 27. However, in the absence of the submission in relation to this appeal of substantive evidence that the replacement dwelling under construction lawfully exists, for the purposes of this appeal, I have proceeded on the basis that the proposed development, No 27A, would be a detached dwelling.
5. Although the red line boundary includes No 27, the proposed development is for one house which is reflected in the blue line boundary and that the proposed floor plans are only illustrated for the proposed new dwelling at 27A.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are:-

- The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area; and
- Whether the proposed development would provide adequate external space standards for future occupants.

Reasons

Character and appearance

7. The appeal site is located between two terraces of two-storey dwellings. The adjoining dwelling at 29 Riverdale Road has a two-storey flat-roofed side extension. The appeal site forms part of a residential plot, which included an extended end of terrace dwelling which was dismantled following a fire and is currently being rebuilt. To the side of the site there is a footpath which runs towards St John's Road.
8. The surrounding area comprises semi-detached and short two-storey terraces with hipped gable roofs. Properties are set back from the road with off street parking to the front. Most of the dwellings have canopies which run along the front of the properties at ground floor level and hipped roofs. Although a number of dwellings have been altered through extensions there remains a regularity to the appearance of the street through the building proportions, building lines and rooflines.
9. The submitted plans show that the proposed dwelling would adjoin a gable end two-storey dwelling, however as set out above, I have considered the proposal as a detached dwelling, which would be separated from the wider terrace. The proposed dwelling would be a two-storey detached dwelling with gable ends. It would have a two-storey flat roof element to the rear, projecting beyond the building line of adjoining properties. To the front there would be a canopy above the ground floor level and one car parking space. The rear of the property would have a large flat roof dormer which would extend across its entire width, with minimum setback from the eaves level and aligning with the ridge line of the main part of the dwelling.
10. The proposal for a detached dwelling would be at odds with the established character of terraced and semi-detached dwellings, thereby interrupting the uniform appearance of the street. The scale and massing of the proposed rear dormer, with lack of setback from ridge and eaves levels, alongside with the gable end roof design would appear top-heavy and overbearing in relation to adjoining dwellings. The proposed dormer and overall roof design would be visually obtrusive additions to the well-proportioned character of the street, eroding the regular pattern of the roofscape. The proposal would be prominent when approaching from Stourton Avenue and between gaps in the dwellings on St John's Road and therefore harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
11. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. It thereby conflicts with Policies SC1, CC1 and CC2 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (2015)

(LP) which amongst other things seeks to secure development that sensitively and creatively responds to an area's character which creates attractive, distinctive and liveable places and maintain the presumption in favour of sustainable development of self-contained residential units within the curtilage of existing dwellings where there is conflict with policies in the plan.

Space standards

12. Policy SC5 of the LP requires new development to provide external space that is usable and affords privacy and security with regard to the requirements set out in Figure SC5.2. The supporting text of the policy explains that these standards reflect the more open outer-suburban character of the borough, which should be maintained so that residents choose to stay.
13. The submitted plans show that the proposed dwelling would have an open plan kitchen/reception on the ground floor, two bedrooms on the first floor and a further bedroom on the second-floor level, thereby providing four habitable rooms in total. Where proposals have four habitable rooms, Policy SC5 requires that no less than 60sqm of usable external amenity space is provided. The proposed garden would provide 55sqm of amenity space in total, which would be less than that required. Moreover, it would have an irregular shaped section towards the rear being reduced to 1.45m wide before opening out again. Whilst this would provide two distinct parts to the garden, and provide areas for garden storage, the narrow section would not, in my view be usable space. Therefore, the proposed level of amenity space does not meet the policy requirements.
14. The appellant has referred me to planning permission, which was granted at 8 Selbourne Gardens, where less than policy requirements were accepted, however this was in a different local planning authority area. Reference has also been made to permission at 32 Riverdale Road, where provision less than that required was considered acceptable. The circumstances in each proposal is likely to be different, and in the case of 32 Riverdale Road, pre-dates the LP. In any event the fact that apparently similar development has been granted permission is not a reason, on its own, to allow unacceptable development.
15. The appellant has also suggested that this part of the garden could provide Biodiversity Net Gain. I have not been provided with any details of this, nevertheless, this would not remove the requirement to provide appropriate levels of external garden space.
16. The proposal would fail to provide adequate external space standards for future occupants. It thereby conflicts with Policy SC5 of the LP, which amongst other things seeks to ensure that new development provides external space that is usable and affords privacy and security.

Other Matters

17. The appellant has raised concerns relating to the conduct of planning officers during the determination of the planning application relating to this case, matters relating to odour complaints and the planning application subject to another appeal at 27 Riverdale Road¹, however these are not matters for me in the determination of this appeal.

¹ APP/F5540/X/24/3349751

Conclusion

18. The proposal would provide an additional dwelling which would contribute towards meeting local housing needs. However, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area and would fail to provide adequate external space standards for future occupants. I therefore conclude that the benefits of the proposal are not sufficient to outweigh the harms that I have identified.
19. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.
20. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Skelly

INSPECTOR