

Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 21 December 2016

by Terry G Phillimore MA MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/16/3156557 (Appeal A) **16 Priory Avenue, London W4 1TY**

- 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 Alex Viall against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00899/16/P4, dated 2 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single storey side extension incorporating a stepped access internally and a stepped access externally at the front and rear.
-

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/Y/16/3156546 (Appeal B) **16 Priory Avenue, London W4 1TY**

- 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 Mr Alex Viall against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00899/16/L4, dated 2 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 June 2016.
 - The works proposed are erection of a single storey side extension incorporating a stepped access internally and a stepped access externally at the front and rear.
-

Decisions

1. Appeals A and B are dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The above description of the proposal is taken from the Council's decision notices, and provides a more succinct summary of the scheme's features than that used on the application forms. The proposal includes the removal of an existing side extension to the ground floor rear of the property.
3. At the site visit I observed that considerably more demolition at the rear of the building than that shown in the current application plans has taken place. This would be subject to the normal controls exercised by the Council, and I have determined the appeals on the basis of the scheme applied for.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect the proposal would have on the special interest of the listed building and the character and appearance of the Bedford Park Conservation Area.
-

Reasons

5. Bedford Park Conservation Area encompasses a well preserved Victorian outer London suburb. Its distinctive Queen Anne style houses incorporate arts and crafts design features with a variety of details and materials. The backs and sides of properties were typically designed to be seen and carefully proportioned. No. 16 is one half of a semi-detached pair with no. 18 which are Grade II listed buildings in a characteristic picturesque style. The original architectural features and layout are important to the significance of the designated heritage assets.
6. As shown in the existing plans, the house is of three storeys with a single storey rear element with roof terrace above projecting beyond the main rear wall. Attached to the side at the end of this, and agreed to be a non-original addition, is a small storeroom structure. It is in the space between the flank elevation of the house and the side boundary of the property onto Rupert Road. This addition is proposed to be demolished.
7. The proposed new extension would also be located within this side space and attached to the flank wall of the house, but set a little further towards the front. Its projection from the flank wall would be similar to that of the existing structure but its depth (front to back) would be greater.
8. In order to minimise the height of the extension it is proposed that this be constructed on a lowered ground level, with steps down to it approaching from along the side and from the rear, as well as an internal stepped link to the rear room. The effect of this reduced level would be to limit the degree of visibility of the upper part of the extension from the road with a boundary fence in place.
9. Given that this property has a corner frontage, the extension would not undermine any fundamental symmetry with no. 18. It is also proposed to use materials and details that would match the main house. However, as a result of the positioning within the side passage, the insertion of the lowered ground level around it and the new access steps, the extension would represent an incongruous addition that would detract from the integrity of the original building. Its detrimental impact in this respect would be greater than that of the structure to be removed given its increased size and more forward positioning together with the surrounding stepped elements.
10. The scale of the proposal is such that it would be a relatively modest addition to the building and the harm to the significance of the heritage assets would be less than substantial, in particular there would be limited impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The harm would nevertheless be material, and carries importance. In such circumstances national guidance is that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing optimum viable use. The appeal property has been used for multiple occupation, and the proposal is part of a scheme to restore it to single family use. The appellant refers to a need for additional storage space as part of this. However, there is no evidence to establish that the property could not provide suitable domestic accommodation with modern facilities in the absence of the proposal, or that it is an essential means to improve side access security. There are no public benefits identified such as to outweigh the harm.

11. The appellant cites other cases within the Conservation Area but none appear to represent the same set of circumstances as here, and I have considered the proposal based on these. I have also taken into account the absence of objections to the proposal.
12. The proposal does not meet the requirements of respect for context and character including with regard to heritage as set out in policies CC1, CC2 and CC4 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030.
13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeals should be dismissed.

T G Phillimore

INSPECTOR