

Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 30 August 2016

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 21 September 2016

Appeal A: APP/F5540/W/16/3149500
4 and 6 Woodstock Road, London W4 1UE

- 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 Ms Carol and Alice Barr and Poole against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01234/4-6/P1, dated 30 September 2015, was refused by notice dated 15 January 2016.
 - The development proposed is a joint application to extend the rear infill extensions by approximately 1.7m.
-

Appeal B: APP/F5540/Y/16/3149501
4 and 6 Woodstock Road, London W4 1UE

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Carol and Alice Barr and Poole against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01234/4-6/L1, dated 30 September 2015, was refused by notice dated 15 January 2015.
 - The work proposed is a joint application to extend the rear infill extensions by approximately 1.7m.
-

Decisions

Appeal A

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a joint application to extend the rear infill extensions by approximately 1.7m at 4 and 6 Woodstock Road, London W4 1UE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 01234/4-6/P1, dated 30 September 2015, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: A603/L1; A603/01; A603/02.
-

Appeal B

2. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for a joint application to extend the rear infill extensions by approximately 1.7m at 4 and 6 Woodstock Road, London W4 1UE in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 01234/4-6/L1 dated 30 September 2015 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The works hereby authorised shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: A603/L1; A603/01; A603/02.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in these appeals is the effects of the extension on the character and appearance of the conservation area and on the special interest of the listed building.

Reasons

4. The appeals relate to this pair of semi-detached houses which are located within the Bedford Park Conservation Area. They are constructed from red brick with pitched, tiled roofs and have white painted details. The houses are grade II listed and display an overall design and detailed features which are characteristic of the original buildings within this conservation area.
5. Both houses have been extended including ones at the rear. The original 'L' shaped rear elevation has been partially infilled at both houses by extensions of different designs. No 6 has also been extended so that the depth of the projecting element of the rear elevation has been added to. The Council's guidance issued in its Residential Extension Guidelines (REGs) sets out that, rear extensions to semi-detached houses will normally be limited to 3.65m so that it would appear secondary to the main house and not unduly affect neighbours. There is no contention in either case that neighbours would be affected and I agree with this.
6. It is apparent that the stepped rear elevation is a characteristic feature of this type of house and this has been retained in the broad sense, notwithstanding the existing extensions. These have resulted in extensions that are stepped back from the deeper part of the rear elevation, retaining some sense of this step. The Council contends that the proposal would result in the loss of this stepped elevation and the gap between the properties would be lost here.
7. The proposal at No 6 would not be as deep as the extended kitchen element and, even though it is an extension itself, the proposal would not be as deep as it. In addition, the proposal would be considerably lower than the kitchen element, which is flat-roofed and has a balustrade above. I consider that this

would mean that the proposal would appear clearly subservient to the main house and not have any unacceptable dominating effect on it.

8. The extension to No 4 would be almost as deep as the deepest part of the rear of the house, with just a small step proposed in the elevation. However, although not as pronounced as at No 6, the extension at No 4 would still be lower than the existing single storey part of No 4, when the main parts of the roof are compared. The proposed lantern-light would be higher than the existing flat roof at its tallest point but lower than the balustrade. In this context, I consider that the extension at No 4 would appear subservient to the main building.
9. In relation to the effects on the conservation area, as a result of the above factors I consider that the character and appearance of the conservation area would be preserved. As a consequence of these matters I find that the proposal would not conflict with Local Plan Policies CC1, CC2 and CC4. Although the extension would be deeper than suggested in the REG, I find no harm to neighbours or the character of the locality or the building itself.

Conditions

10. The Council has suggested 3 conditions; I agree that the standard time limit for commencement is acceptable in each appeal. It is necessary to ensure that the materials used in the extension are agreed so that it does not disrupt the listed building or conservation area. A condition requiring compliance with the approved drawings is also necessary to ensure certainty.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons set out above, both appeals are allowed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR