
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 April 2017

by D Boffin BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI Dip Bldg Cons (RICS) IHBC

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

Decision date: 11 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3167384

14 Waldeck Road, Chiswick, London W4 3NP

- 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 & Mrs Hanreck against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01161/14/P3, dated 18 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as "*first floor extension to existing bedroom. To run concurrent with no. 16 Waldeck Road planning application for a first floor extension*".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The above description which is taken from the application form and the appellants' Statement of Case refers to a planning application and appeal for a similar extension at 16 Waldeck Road. However, that appeal is not before me and I am required to determine this appeal on its own individual merits.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Strand on the Green Conservation Area. (SOTGCA)

Reasons

4. The appeal property is sited in a northern part of the SOTGCA. From the details available to me and my own observations at the site visit I consider that the significance of the SOTGCA is largely drawn from the form of the historic development alongside the River Thames and the terraced housing that is to the rear of that development. The part of SOTGCA around the appeal site is characterised by terraced housing with house types that utilise a similar palette of materials and architectural detailing providing a harmonious regularity. There are modern 4-storey flats on Kew Bridge Court to the north of Waldeck Road.
 5. The appeal property is a mid-terrace dwelling which has a 2-storey outrigger and lean-to single storey extension to the rear and the majority of dwellings in the terrace appear to have ground floor rear extensions and dormer windows to
-

the main roof. I noted at my site visit that the 2-storey outriggers with flat or very shallow mono-pitch roofs are a common feature of the majority of dwellings in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. As such, they are architectural features that are part of the character, appearance and significance of SOTGCA.

6. The proposal would involve a metal clad mezzanine floor extension above the existing outrigger. I acknowledge that the proposal would not create a significant amount of additional floorspace. However, despite the use of sympathetic materials and its set back from the rear elevation the extension would introduce a built form of a size, position and design that is not present on other outriggers in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site.
7. Consequently, it would fundamentally alter the design of the outrigger resulting in a bulky addition to its roof that would be dominant eroding the harmonious regularity that is provided by the outriggers of this terrace. The effect of the scheme would be reasonably localised but it would diminish unacceptably the character and appearance of the host building and its associated terrace with consequent harm to the character and appearance of the SOTGCA.
8. The rear elevations of the dwellings on this part of Waldeck Road are visible from the end of Hearne Road adjacent to Kew Bridge Court. The extension would be visible from the rear gardens of the adjacent properties and the flats on Kew Bridge Court. Irrespective, the requirement for development proposals to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of SOTGCA applies with equal force whether or not the proposal is prominent or in public view.
9. The appellants have drawn my attention to an extension at 78 Waldeck Road and I took the opportunity to view it from the pedestrian bridge above the railway at my site visit. Whilst I do not have the full details of the case I note that the site is not within SOTGCA. As such, the circumstances of that case are not a direct parallel to the appeal proposal. In any case, nothing that I saw persuaded me that the development subject of this appeal is acceptable in this location and I am required to determine the appeal on its own merits.
10. I acknowledge that the Council have not raised objection to the scheme in relation to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers and that there were no objections from any adjacent properties but these are neutral considerations that do not weigh for or against the proposal. Whilst I acknowledge the appellants' needs to provide additional accommodation for their family, such needs do not override the harm I have identified above.
11. I consider that the proposal would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the SOTGCA and would cause less than substantial harm to its significance as a heritage asset on the basis that the development would harm only part of its significance. There are no public benefits to outweigh the harm caused. I have attached considerable importance and weight to the desirability of avoiding any such harmful effect in accordance with S72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
12. Accordingly the proposal conflicts with Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan which, amongst other things, seek to secure high quality architecture that sensitively and creatively responds to an area's character, does not harm the existing character and appearance of the building and conserves and takes opportunities to enhance the character of the

Conservation Area. It would also not comply with guidance in the Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Guidance which states that new extensions should never dominate in terms of bulk. It would also not accord with paragraph 134 of the Framework.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

D. Boffin

INSPECTOR