

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2017

**by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDurp MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 15<sup>th</sup> November 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3180814**

**15 Crofton Avenue, Chiswick, London W4 3EW**

- 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 Christian Harper against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
  - The application Ref 01615/15/P5, dated 23 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 21 June 2017.
  - The development proposed is reconfiguration of the ground floor front facade, replacing the existing garage door with a solid blockwork wall finished in white render, re-alignment of a portion of the facade and insertion of two windows.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for reconfiguration of the ground floor front facade, replacing the existing garage door with a solid blockwork wall finished in white render, re-alignment of a portion of the facade and insertion of two windows at 15 Crofton Avenue, Chiswick, London W4 3EW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 01615/15/P5, dated 23 April 2017, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: EX\_00, EX\_01, EX\_02, EX\_04, EX\_10, EX\_11, EX\_20, EX\_40, EX\_200, PL\_00, PL\_01, PL\_02, PL\_04, PL\_10, PL\_11, PL\_40, PL\_400, PL\_401, PL\_402, PL\_410, FE\_20 and FE\_24.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall either match those used in the existing building or be as specified within the application.

### Procedural Matters

2. It appears that amended plans were submitted to the Council prior to the application being determined (PL\_10 Rev A and PL\_410 Rev A). However the Council did not accept the amended plans and determined the application having regard to the originally submitted plans. The appellant's statement also refers to the original plans. Whilst I have been provided with a copy of the amended plans it does not appear that any consultation took place on them. Therefore in reaching my decision I have had regard to the originally submitted plans.

3. My attention has been drawn to another proposal at the site that is currently at appeal (Ref APP/F5540/D/17/3184872) and which relates to the conversion of the garage and to extensions and alterations to the rear of the host building. However the other appeal has yet to be determined and the Council has confirmed that it does include any alterations to the front of the host building. Consequently in reaching my decision I have not had regard to this other proposal.

### **Main Issue**

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

### **Reasons**

5. The appeal site is located in the Chiswick House Conservation Area (CA). The Councils' Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) states that the character of the CA is focused on the status and quality of Chiswick House, a Grade I Listed Building and its grounds. With regard to dwellings, the CAA states that symmetry is important when looking at properties in pairs, that the rhythm of the terrace is important when looking at properties in identical groups. It also seeks restoration and retention of original details, with architectural integrity in extension and alteration work.
6. The appeal site comprises a relatively modern three storey, mid terrace property located within a development of properties of a similar design, scale and appearance. The host building and its neighbours are classically proportioned and incorporate white render to the ground floor with London stock bricks above. The host building is positioned centrally within a small terrace of three properties, with each property having recessed areas and garages at ground floor. There are three other such terraces nearby on Crofton Avenue. The terrace incorporating the host building is not symmetrical and the garage door at the host building is set further forward than the garage doors of the neighbouring properties at 14 and 16 Crofton Avenue.
7. Whilst the proposal would result in the loss of an existing pilaster and of the garage door and would infill part of the ground floor which is currently recessed, it would introduce more symmetry to the front elevation of the host building and the terrace. In addition the entrance door would remain recessed, two pilasters would be retained at either end of the host building and the windows and render would match the neighbouring properties. Consequently though the proposal would be visible from Crofton Avenue and would change the original proportions of the front elevation, I do not consider that it would be harmful or visually jarring, disrupt the rhythm of the terrace or dominate the character and appearance of either the host building or the street.
8. Taking the above matters into consideration I conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA in accordance with the expectations of section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. For the same reasons it would also accord with the development plan and in particular policies SC7, CC1, CC2 and CC4 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan and with relevant guidance contained within sections 6.0 and 8.0 of the Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines adopted October 2003. These policies and this guidance seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development proposals including residential extensions

are well designed in relation to the host building, respond to their context and preserve the character of conservation areas.

### **Conditions**

9. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant plans as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring the proposal to be constructed from materials as detailed within the application and to match the existing building where appropriate. This is having regard to the sites location in a conservation area and in order to protect the character and appearance of the host building and the CA. The wording of the materials conditions differs slightly from the one suggested by the Council to reflect the fact that not all of the suggested materials for the proposal match the host building.

### **Conclusion**

10. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*Beverley Wilders*

INSPECTOR