

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2016

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20TH December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/16/3158778

2A The Ridgeway, Chiswick, London, W3 8LL

- 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 Ali Issa against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00940/2A/P1 dated 25 April 2016 was refused by notice dated 17 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a single storey side extension to the house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have utilised and amended the description of development from the LPA's decision notice, which more concisely and accurately describes the proposal than the application form.
3. The development had already been undertaken at the time of my visit. The submitted plans differ from the development undertaken as they do not show the roof overhanging to create a canopy at the front elevation of the subject extension. For clarity, I have considered the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is located on the corner of The Ridgeway, at its junction with Gunnersbury Avenue (North Circular Road). It is situated within the Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area and is a two storey end-terrace property with a mainly rendered finish and a hipped roof form. Many of the surrounding properties have similar features, which alongside the grass verges and street trees, gives the area an attractive cohesive, verdant character.
-

6. The appeal development is for a single storey side extension to the property. It is set back from the main two storey front elevation of the appeal building, with a width of around 2m. I acknowledge that this side extension projects beyond the rear two storey wall to adjoin a rear single storey element of the appeal property. Whilst the *Residential Extension Guidelines* Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) states that extensions that wrap around to meet a rear extension will normally be refused, in this instance, given the narrow width of the side extension and the form of the side garden, which tapers to be wider at the rear, the scale of the appeal development does not appear dominant or out of proportionate to the existing house.
7. The walls of the side extension are however finished in timber cladding which contrasts sharply with the largely rendered finish of the main property and the prevailing use of render as a wall material in the area. Although the roof tiles are similar to the main property and I note the reference to the 'Mock Tudor' frontages of properties, this does not mitigate against the visually jarring nature of the walls of the extension against the main property. I was able to see at the time of my visit that the site has a high side boundary fence and gate. Whilst these, alongside a shed and the presence of vegetation offer a certain degree of screening, the appeal development is still visible, particularly to the south from Gunnersbury Avenue where it appears as an incongruous feature.
8. I therefore conclude that the appeal development fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area. It is contrary to Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the Council's Local Plan, which support, amongst other matters, extensions and alterations to residential properties provided they maintain the character of an area and development that conserves or takes the opportunity to enhance the significance of the Borough's heritage assets and their settings. It also conflicts with the SPG, which requires, amongst other matters, development in Conservation Areas to be of a high standard of design and to be built out of material that reflect or exactly match the original building.
9. In relation to designated heritage assets, Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework indicates that where there would be harm that is less than substantial, as in this case, it must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposals. The development, in terms of generating building work has supported the economy. I do not however consider that this factor outweighs the harm I have identified to the Conservation Area.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has made reference to the formation of an enclosed space around 12 years ago, which the appeal development has replaced. Some information on the footprint of this structure have been provided, but I have not been made aware of the full details or of those relating to the referenced extension at No. 10. Many of the surrounding properties have had some form of extension but each development needs to be considered on its own circumstances. I can confirm that I have considered the appeal before me on its own merits.
11. The appeal property was a modern addition to the terrace and was of a limited width. The appeal development has provided additional space, a better layout

and ground floor bedroom for a growing family and the building has been renovated. I also note the appellant's reference to the appeal extension being Permitted Development if it was situated outside a Conservation Area. None of these matters would however outweigh the harm that I have identified in respect of the main issue.

12. As the extension is located to the side of the existing property, I do not consider that there would be any adverse effects on neighbouring residential occupiers. The proposal has also not given rise to any unacceptable adverse effects on access, parking or waste removal arrangements. These are however neutral considerations and not benefits of the proposal. The appellant has also stated that there are errors in the LPA's documents but no specific references have been made.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, including reference to an Enforcement Notice, precedence and representations objecting to the proposal, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR