
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2017

by Michael Moffoot DipTP MRTPI DipMgt MCMI

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

Decision date: 7th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/16/3161659

Riccado, 204 Chiswick High Road, Chiswick, London W4 1PD

- 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 A K Bector against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref. 00248/204/P7, dated 4 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a new roof extension to existing studio to create 1 x two bed three person maisonette.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and its surroundings, including whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. This part of the Conservation Area is characterised by predominantly three-storey terraced buildings of imposing and generally consistent scale, width and rhythm. Here, Chiswick High Road is a broad tree-lined thoroughfare with wide pavements that together impart a distinct sense of spaciousness. The majority of the buildings retain their original detailing, with a regular fenestration pattern, distinctive well detailed parapets and a consistency of materials.
 4. The appeal property is consistent with this character. It comprises a mid-terrace three-storey building of brick construction under a pitched 'butterfly' roof set behind a parapet, and includes single and two-storey extensions to the rear. The properties to either side are very similar in design and appearance whilst those to the east are more elaborate, with a mix of painted quoins, ornamental parapets and large windows contained by ornate dressed stone surrounds. The two-storey building at the western end of the terrace incorporates similar architectural detailing but is constructed of red brick under a slate roof and features a distinctive central full-height bay. Despite a variation in fenestration and design detailing, the three-storey element of the terrace maintains a distinct architectural rhythm that makes a significant
-

contribution to the character and appearance of the street scene and the Conservation Area.

5. Although the proposed mansard roof extension would be higher than the parapet it would be slightly set back, which would limit views of the new structure from street level. Nevertheless, the upper part would be visible above the parapet from the south side of Chiswick High Road and obliquely from the northern end of Devonshire Road. Moreover, it would be visible from the upper floors of properties on the south side of the main road. From these vantage points the extension would be perceived as a random and discordant addition which breaches the roofline and compromises the architectural integrity of the building, the terrace and the wider street scene. In doing so it would conflict with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: *Residential Extension Guidelines* (2003) which advises that the creation of mansard extensions will not normally fit in with the character of an area.
6. I saw no other comparable extensions to properties within the terrace. Reference is made to mansard roof additions to other buildings in the vicinity of the appeal site which I saw during my visit. However, I do not know the considerations that were taken into account by the Council in resolving to grant planning permission in these cases or whether they pre-dated the designation of the Conservation Area. In any case, most do not constitute examples of sympathetic development in an urban location and Conservation Area and do not therefore justify the appeal proposal.
7. Drawing these findings together, I conclude that the proposed development would seriously harm the character and appearance of the appeal site and its surroundings and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. As such, it would conflict with those parts of Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the *Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030* which seek to ensure that new development conserves and enhances the Borough's special and distinctive qualities, heritage assets and built environment by supporting high quality and refusing poor quality design.
8. In terms of the *National Planning Policy Framework*, the proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset. However, this harm is not outweighed by any public benefits of the scheme.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposal is unacceptable and the appeal should fail.

Michael Moffoot

Inspector