
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2017

by J A B Gresty MA MRICS

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

Decision date: 09 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3176175
60 Park Road, Chiswick, London W4 3HH

- 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 Jasbir Sidhu against the decision of the Council for the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01255/60/P1, dated 2 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is demolition of porch, garage, utility room and outbuildings. Construction of partial basement, full width ground floor rear extension and new front porch, part first floor rear extension, two-storey side extension and roof extension with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of porch, garage, utility room and outbuildings, construction of a new front porch and a rear dormer at 60 Park Road, Chiswick, London W4 3HH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 01255/60/P1, dated 2 December 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Numbers 182P.L1, 182P.L2, 182P.L3, 182P.L4, 182P.L5, 182P.L6, 182P.L7, 182P.L8, 182P.L9, 182P.L10, 182P.L11, 182P.L12, 182P.L13, 182P.L14 & 182P.L15.
2. The appeal is dismissed with respect to construction of partial basement, full width ground floor rear extension, part first floor rear extension, two-storey side extension and roof extension.

Main Issues

3. There are two main issues in this case. Firstly is the effect on the character and appearance of the Chiswick House Conservation Area. Secondly is the effect of
-

the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 62 Park Road with respect to daylight and outlook.

Reasons

Character & Appearance

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached house. The surrounding area is primarily residential and Park Road forms part of the Chiswick House Conservation Area. Park Road is characterised by substantial detached and semi-detached houses, most dating from the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Whilst the appeal property is not as ornate or as imposing as some of the properties on Park Road, the pair of houses reflect the design of other houses nearby and they form an attractive feature which contribute positively to the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area.
5. The appeal proposal includes construction of a two-storey side extension. The front wall of the extension would be set back from that of the main house, creating a clear visual break between the host property and the extension when viewed from the road. The side extension would have a hipped roof which would be in keeping with the existing hipped roofs of the pair of houses.
6. At the front the two-storey side extension would be about two metres wide. To the rear it would wrap around the back of the house, projecting about three metres from the line of the main back wall of the house and the side of the extension would be open to view from the road.
7. Although the adjoining house, 58 Park Road, has a dormer on the side elevation of its hipped roof, the pair of houses has a strongly symmetrical appearance when viewed from the road which contributes positively to their appearance in the street scene. The Chiswick House Conservation Area Appraisal identifies symmetry as being important when viewing properties in pairs and with respect to Park Road the appraisal identifies that unbalancing the symmetry of pairs of properties can alter their character and appearance. Further, the London Borough of Hounslow Supplementary Planning Guidance *Residential Extension Guidelines* (Residential SPG) identifies that where a side extension to a property in a Conservation Area rises to the eaves of the host property, it may not be acceptable to extend the property by a side extension where it unbalances a pair of properties. In this case the proposed two-storey side extension would result in a significant unbalancing of the pair of houses, contrary to the aims of the Residential SPG.
8. Overall, whilst aspects of its design would complement the design of the host property, the two-storey side extension would appear large and bulky when viewed from the road and it would result in considerable loss of symmetry, harming the appearance of the pair of houses in the street scene. This would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Chiswick House Conservation Area and would be contrary to the requirements of Policies CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (LP).
9. The appeal scheme includes construction of a flat-roofed dormer in the rear elevation of the main house roof. Whilst the flat-roofed design of the dormer would not enhance the appearance of the appeal property, the dormer would be very similar in size and appearance to a dormer installed in the rear elevation of

No 58's roof. The dormer would be relatively small in comparison to the size of the main house roof and it would not be an unduly prominent feature of the rear elevation of the house. Consequently the proposed new dormer would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the pair of houses and it would accord with LP Policies CC2, CC4 and SC7.

10. The appeal property has an enclosed front porch with large plane glass windows and a roof which is almost flat, giving the porch a relatively stark appearance which does not complement the appearance of the pair of houses. The proposed development includes demolition of the porch and construction of a new porch which would have a pitched roof and an open design which would match that of the adjoining house. The new porch would complement the original design of the appeal property and enhance the symmetry of the pair of houses. This would result in a significant improvement in the appearance of the front elevation of the pair of houses and an improvement in the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area and it would accord with the requirements of LP Policies CC2, CC4 and SC7.
11. The appeal proposal includes construction of a single-storey, flat-roof extension which would project 3.65 metres from the rear elevation of the existing house. The extension would span nearly half of the width of the house and its flank wall would stand on the boundary with No 58's back garden. The height and depth of the extension would be within the limits set by Residential SPG and whilst the flat-roofed design of the extension would not complement the design of the host building, the extension would not be a prominent feature of the building and on balance I conclude it would accord with the requirements of LP Policies CC2, CC4 and SC7.
12. There would also be a flat-roofed, single-storey projection to the rear of the proposed two-storey extension. The single-storey extension would project about 2.5 metres from the rear elevation of the two-storey extension and over 5 metres from the line of the rear elevation of the existing house. The combined overall depth of the single-storey and two-storey extensions is greater than the Residential SPG indicates would normally be acceptable for a single-storey extension of a semi-detached dwelling. However, the appeal property has a good sized garden and overall the single-storey element of this part of the development would not appear unduly large or dominant in relation to the host building. Therefore, I conclude that on its own the single-storey extension to the southern part of the rear elevation of the appeal property would not be reason to dismiss this appeal.
13. The appeal proposal includes demolition of the existing side extension, garage and outbuildings. These elements of the appeal property are not prominent in the street scene and do not contribute positively to the character or appearance of the host building. Accordingly, their removal would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Living Conditions

14. The flank wall of the proposed two-storey extension would stand very close to the boundary with No 62. When viewed from No 62 the extension would appear very large and prominent. However, close views of the extension from No 62 would be limited. No 62's first floor window which faces the appeal property is

obscure glazed and No 62's ground floor side extension is served by roof lights and does not have windows which face No 60 directly. The roof of proposed two-storey extension would be visible from No 62's dormer window at second floor level but, because of its hipped design, the roof would not appear unduly prominent when seen from No 62's dormer window.

15. Further, the proposed two-storey extension would be to the north of No 62 and would result in little if any loss of direct sunlight and little diffuse natural daylight reaching No 62's windows and roof lights. No 62 would appear to have a small back garden which is not close to the site of the proposed two-storey and views of the proposed extension from the back garden area would be partially obscured by No 62's own buildings. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would not result in undue harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 62 with respect to loss of light and outlook and would accord with LP Policies SC7 and CC2 in this respect.

Conclusions

16. The development scheme consists of several distinct parts, some of which I am able to separate. Accordingly, I issue a split decision.
17. At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. In this case the proposed two-storey side and rear extension would result in significant harm to the appearance of the pair of semi-detached houses in the street scene with consequential harm to the character and appearance of the Chiswick House Conservation Area. Accordingly, the proposed two-storey extension would not represent sustainable development as sought by the Framework and, on balance and for the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed with respect to the proposed two-storey extension and the proposed basement and full width rear extensions which appear to be integral to the proposed two-storey extension.
18. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed with respect to the proposed front porch, the proposed dormer window and demolition of the garage and outbuilding.

Conditions

19. For the sake of clarity, I impose a condition requiring the approved development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
20. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the proposed porch and dormer, I impose a condition which would require the materials used in the external surfaces to the structures to match those of the existing dwelling.

J A B Gresty

INSPECTOR