
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 June 2017

by Jonathan Hockley BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3174296

46 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 Gilmour against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01161/46/P3, dated 8 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side infill extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side infill extension at 46 Waldeck Road, Chiswick, London W4 3NP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 01161/46/P3, dated 8 December 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents: 16008 [EX] 001 Rev A, 16008[GA]100 Rev A, 16008[GA]200 Rev B, 16008[GA]300 Rev B, Flood Risk Assessment dated 11/01/17.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is whether the proposed extension would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Strand on the Green Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The Strand on the Green Conservation Area (SGCA) is based on the River Thames, with the Conservation Area boundaries encompassing much of the river from Kew Bridge towards the south west, including a swathe of land largely set between the river and railway line. The area incorporates the buildings set along the river edge, including commercial uses and elegant private houses, as well as the Victorian and Edwardian terraced housing that lies behind this frontage. The special interest of the area can be defined
-

through the picturesque charm of the area, with dense yet peaceful terraced streets leading down and along the river edge.

4. No 46 Waldeck Road lies on the northern fringes of the SGCA, and dates from around 1900. The property lies towards the eastern end of a long stretch of attractive two storey terraced houses, all of which have distinctive roof parapet walls, chamfered single bay windows to front and noticeable 3 windows above, forming symmetrical pairs with their neighbours. To the rear the houses have two storey outriggers and many have single story flat or pitched roof extensions attached to the outriggers. Many of the rear roofscapes of the terrace have substantial dormer windows inserted, of varying degrees of quality of design.
5. No 46 has a flat roofed single storey extension. A small passage between this extension, outrigger and the close boarded fence that forms the boundary between No 46 and No 44 Waldeck Road exists and was used for some general storage on my visit. The proposal seeks to construct a single storey lean to covering this area. The lean to would extend to the same rear building line as the existing single storey extension and would be roofed primarily with rooflights. The scheme would allow the existing ground floor wall to be partially removed. Alterations would also be made to the rear wall of the single storey extension, but the roof and essential form of this existing structure would be retained.
6. The Council's Residential Extension Guidelines (the REG)¹ states that any new development in conservation areas must be of a high standard of design. For older houses built in an 'L' shape, extensions which would block in the shape next to the rear addition and wrap around the rear part of the original addition will normally be refused. A drawing showing a complete wrap around extension with angled roof is shown in the document as inappropriate.
7. Whilst I clearly note the contents of the REG, I am not convinced in this case that it strictly applies. The primarily glass roof of the proposal and its lean to design will ensure that the extension will appear lightweight and fully subordinate to both the existing flat roof extension and to the original outrigger, in a way which the diagrammatic example in the REG would not. The original outline and staggered 'L' shape of the property will still be clearly visible and read, and the proposal would thus not harm the rhythm of the rear of the terrace. In such a way I do not consider that the proposal would cause harm to the property, and for the same reasons nor would the scheme harm the character and appearance of the SGCA.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would preserve the character and appearance of the Strand on the Green Conservation Area. The proposal would comply with policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the Local Plan², which when taken together state that high quality extensions of residential properties will be supported which do not harm the built environment, which complement and are subordinate to the original building, and that the Council will sustain and conserve those areas, including conservation areas, which have a high quality, well established and coherent character.

¹ London Borough of Hounslow Residential Extension Guidelines, October 2003.

² London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030

Conditions

9. I have imposed conditions regarding time limits for implementation and approval of plans, as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition to ensure that the materials of the proposal match those used in the existing property, in the interests of the character and appearance of the host property.

Conclusion

10. My findings should not be taken as an indication that I disagree with the thrust of the Council's residential extensions guidance. However, each proposal must be considered on its own merits and on this occasion I have concluded that the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the SCGCA. Therefore, for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Jon Hockley

INSPECTOR