



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2017

by Jonathon Parsons MSc BSc(Hons) DipTP Cert(Urb) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3181370

99 Prebend Gardens, Chiswick, London W6 0XT

- 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 Pantelyat against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00899/99/P1, dated 28 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 12 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is "basement, ground floor, first floor and loft extension to the rear. Basement, ground and first floor extension to the side to replace original attached garage. New front brick wall. North flank brick wall height increase."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Stamford Brook Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two storey dwelling with roof accommodation above which has a side single storey addition, a rear two storey outrigger and a roof dormer above this. The property lies between the end of a row of terraced dwellings and a green space at the corner of Prebend Gardens and Bath Road/Stamford Brook Road. There is also a green space opposite the property that lies between Stamford Brook Road and semi-detached dwellings along South Parade. The appeal site and surrounding area lie within the Stamford Brook Conservation Area.
4. Within the Conservation Area, the prevailing pattern of development is older terraced and semi-detached dwellings. They are traditionally designed with bay windows and porches with tiled roof overhangs, and constructed with decorative architectural detailing, such as window surrounds. At first floor, bays are mainly tile hang or with render/painted brickwork with painted black timber. Mostly, there is also a symmetrical balance of architectural features and detailing, with many dwellings forming pairs that mirror one another in appearance. Together with the green spaces, it is these historic, architectural and aesthetic features which are of significance and importance, and of special interest to the Conservation Area.

5. The appeal property is detached but has an attractive front symmetrical face with a central positioned porch and has two storey bays with gables above, either side. The roof is fully hipped with chimneys at either end of the building. The first floor bays are brick faced and there is contrasting coloured brickwork around windows and at the corners of the building. The side addition is stepped back from the front façade which together with its small size, ensures subservience. Although poorly proportioned, the rear dormer does not dominate the rear roof by reason of its small size. Despite the two storey nature of the outrigger, the balanced form and shape of the dwelling of the rear elevation remains, along with similar decorative brickwork. In summary, the dwelling contributes positively to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
6. On the rear elevation, there would be a single storey extension across the full width of the dwelling including the two storey side extension, which would be approximately 3.1m in height. Additionally, there would be a partial first floor extension attached to the two storey outrigger with pitched roof and dormers above including across the outrigger. Together with the rear of the two storey side extension, such a scale of extensions and alterations would visually overwhelm the original form and proportions of the dwelling. On the front façade, the two storey extension would be stepped back from the front façade and have a lower roof ridge. However, the first floor window would upset this subservience by reason of its four pane window size, and consequently would be visually awkward.
7. There are trees alongside the side boundary with the green space but the rear elevation of the dwelling would become more noticeable during the winter due to the largely deciduous nature of the vegetation. In any case, the extent of additional building would be noticeable given the height of the first floor elements to the side and rear, and the ground floor elements, being approximately 3.1m. Furthermore despite the trees' presence with the Conservation Area, there is no guarantee that they can be retained in perpetuity and any replacement planting would take time to establish. There can be any number of reasons why vegetation has to be removed, such as disease or accidental damage. Therefore, the screening effect of such vegetation is not sufficient to justify the development.
8. The proposal would remove a poorly designed dormer within the roof of the dwelling but this benefit would not override the adverse effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling by virtue of the extent of the proposed built works. The church at the bottom of the garden of the appeal property is modern in design and external materials. Nevertheless, the garden provides significant separation from this neighbouring development and therefore, this development has not adversely affected the context of the appeal dwelling and the way it is appreciated. The church development is furthermore located outside the Conservation Area. Finally, the appeal proposal has been subject to pre-application discussions with the Council setting out an alternative scheme. Nevertheless, I have considered the proposal put before me and determined on its particular planning merits.
9. In conclusion, the proposal would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the Conservation Area for the reasons indicated. Accordingly, the proposal would be contrary to policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030, which collectively and amongst other matters,

requires due regard to urban context and character, the retention, promotion and support of high quality urban design to create attractive, distinctive and liveable places, conservation and taking of opportunities to enhance the character of the area and for extensions to complement the existing building.

10. As paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) makes clear, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.
11. The harm identified above would be less than substantial and it is necessary in line with paragraph 134 of the Framework that the identified harm is weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. There have been no substantive public benefits identified. The harm to the Conservation Area's significance would be considerable for the reasons indicated and applying the balance in paragraph 134, I consider that such harm would be of a scale that would outweigh the scheme's benefits.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathon Parsons

INSPECTOR