

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 January 2017

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23rd August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3176425

25 Heathfield Gardens, Chiswick, London, W4 4JU

- 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 Ms Pauline Campbell against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref P/2016/5537, dated 9 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a hip to gable roof extension to both sides, incorporating a front roof window to the house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is whether the proposed extensions would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Wellesley Road Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. No 25 Heathfield Gardens is a wide-fronted, two-storey detached house with a hipped roof, situated on the eastern side of the road, almost opposite to its junction with Grosvenor Road. The road is characterised by a mix of detached and semi-detached houses on its eastern side, with a mix of largely two- and three-storey semi-detached and terraced houses on the western side.
 4. The proposed development would involve the construction of a hip to gable extension to each side of the existing roof, with two small dormer extensions to the rear roof slope. There is a mix of hipped-roof and gable-roofed properties along the road, although the detached houses appear to be characterised by having hipped roofs, and there are detached houses with hipped roofs at various points along the road. In this context, the proposal would result in a discordant visual element in the street scene.
 5. No 23 Heathfield Gardens is a detached house that forms a terminal vista to Grosvenor Road. It has two front gables and a largely symmetrical façade. It is flanked by two other detached houses, including the appeal property, which have hipped roofs and which also form part of the terminal vista, thus
-

complementing the symmetry of No 23. Houses to the north and south of the group formed by Nos 21-25 are semi-detached houses with gable roofs, but other detached houses along the road also have hipped roofs.

6. The appellant notes that two pairs of semi-detached houses to the south of the appeal property have gable ends, and that No 25 would not appear out of character with these. However, whilst I have little information about these houses, it would appear that they have had hip to gable conversions at various different times in the past and No 27, adjacent to the appeal property, had permission for such a conversion in order to create a balance with No 29, which had been converted earlier. In any case, the differing circumstances and contexts of the roof types in the nearby semi-detached houses cannot be seen as a precedent for a hip to gable conversion at the appeal property, which continues the theme of hipped roofs at detached houses along the road, and which is part of the largely symmetrical group of three houses forming the terminal vista at the junction of Grosvenor Road and Heathfield Gardens.
7. On the basis of the above, the proposal would be harmful to the prevailing character and appearance of the streetscene and roofscape of the road, and it would therefore fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Wellesley Road Conservation Area (CA).
8. In conclusion, I find that the proposed hip to gable extensions would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this case there are no public benefits to weigh against the harm.
9. Finally, the proposal would conflict with Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the Council's Local Plan, which require development, including residential extensions and alterations, to sustain, conserve and enhance areas of high quality design, including conservation areas, and to respond to the context of the host building and the surrounding area.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR