



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2019

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/19/3238496

118 Park Road, Chiswick, London, W4 3HP

- 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 Michael Appiah-Kusi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01255/118/P5, dated 19 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension, single storey side extension and associated alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey rear extension, single storey side extension and associated alterations at 118 Park Road, Chiswick, London, W4 3HP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 01255/118/P5, dated 19 July 2019, 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: Location Plan, Block Plan, 954-PL-201 Rev D; 954-PL-202 Rev D, 954-PL-203 Rev E, 954-PL-205 Rev F.
 - 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 Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including Chiswick House Conservation Area; and
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of occupiers of the adjacent dwellings.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is located within Chiswick House Conservation Area (the 'CA'). The CA is large and is focused on Chiswick House and its grounds, including surrounding streets comprising 19th and 20th century housing, included to protect views into and from Chiswick House and its grounds and also due to their high-quality detailing and design. Park Road is noted in the Conservation Character Appraisal as comprising well detailed Victorian and Edwardian properties. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling which is reflective of the character and appearance of the CA.
4. The proposed development would involve the demolition of existing single storey lean-to extensions, including a conservatory, which are of a poor quality and do not make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the dwelling or the CA. The proposed rear extension would be of a very similar depth to the existing extensions to be demolished. Furthermore, it has been brought to my attention that planning permission¹ was granted by the Council in May 2019 for a rear extension of the same footprint and depth as that now proposed. This extension included a glazed element to the rear which the Council considered to be more appropriate in its appearance compared to the current proposal.
5. The proposed rear extension would be of a brick built design, with a flat roof and a uniform height of about 3.1metres. It would be constructed in materials to match the existing property and in my view would integrate satisfactorily with the design of the host dwelling. It would be of the same depth as the existing / consented rear extension and would not dominate the host dwelling in terms of its bulk, scale or design, thereby retaining a subservient and secondary relationship to it. The proposed extension would replace existing extensions to the dwelling and would not result in any material loss of spaciousness afforded by the garden of the dwelling. Overall, the proposed extension would be of an acceptable size, scale, design and appearance and would not result in material harm to the character and appearance of the area.
6. I acknowledge that the depth of the proposed extension would exceed 3.65 metres, which conflicts with advice on rear extensions to semi-detached properties, as contained within the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (the 'SPD'). However, whilst the SPD is a material consideration, I have assessed the proposal on its own merits having regard to the particular circumstances that apply in this case, including the existing and consented extensions to the dwelling.
7. The statutory duty in Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is a matter of considerable importance and weight. The proposed rear extension would replace existing structures which do not make a positive contribution to the conservation area. The proposed extension is of an appropriate design and appearance and by using appropriate materials would complement the character of the existing house and surrounding area. As such, the proposed development would have a neutral

¹ Council ref: 01255/118/P2

impact upon and thus preserve the character and appearance of the CA as a whole. Accordingly, there would be no conflict with Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan which together require development to promote high quality design which responds to the sites context and maintains the character of the area and to conserve and where appropriate enhance the Borough's heritage assets. Whilst the London Plan is referred to by the Council in the decision notice, no specific policies have been drawn to my attention. The proposal would comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in relation to design and heritage issues.

Effect on living conditions

8. The existing lean-to extensions to the appeal property and the previously approved rear extension (Council Ref: 01255/118/P2) exceed the guideline depth of 3.65 metres for rear extensions to semi-detached dwellings, as set out in the SPD. According to the officer report, the previously approved extension was found to be acceptable as it comprised of a 3.65m brick extension and a 1.85m glass addition. There does not however, appear to be a distinction in terms of materials within the SPD.
9. The proposed extension would replace existing structures of a similar size and scale. It would have a uniform height of about 3.1metres and would be of solid construction. The proposed extension would be adjacent to an existing single storey rear extension to 120 Park Road, the rear section of which is glazed. The proposed extension would extend beyond the extension to No 120 but not to a significant extent. I have had regard to the Daylight and Sunlight report submitted with the application which assesses the potential impact of the proposed extension on 120 Park Road. This Report concludes that the effect of the extension upon daylight would not be material. Having had regard to the technical evidence and my own observations on site I concur with this view. The proposed extension would have a low height of around 3.1 metres and having regard to the positioning of the extension to No 120 adjacent to the shared boundary, I am satisfied that the proposal would not result in a significant increased sense of enclosure or loss of outlook.
10. The proposed extension would be set in from the shared boundary with 116 Park Road by approximately 1 metre and would be built to the same depth as the existing structure and extant consent. Whilst No 116 has not been extended to the rear, the proposed extension would be partly screened by the existing fence and other boundary planting. I acknowledge that the rear section of the proposed extension would be brick rather than glazed, however given its low height and positioning set back from the boundary, the extension would be unlikely to result in any significant additional harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 116 in terms of loss of light or sense of enclosure / outlook.
11. In conclusion, I find the proposed extension would not have a significant harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings. The proposal would therefore comply with Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the LP insofar as they seek to minimise harm to neighbouring residents, in terms of unacceptable loss of daylight/sunlight, outlook, or creating an unacceptable sense of enclosure. Whilst the London Plan is referred to by the Council in the decision notice, no specific policies have been drawn to my attention. I also consider that the proposal would comply with the

Framework which seeks a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard 3 years implementation condition, the approved plans condition is imposed for clarity. I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be constructed with matching materials in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR