



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2020

by K A Taylor MSC URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Thursday, 27 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/19/3242251

Flat First and Second Floor 59 & 61A Ellesmere Road, Chiswick W4 3EA

- 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 D Ilic & Mr N Elbaz against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00392/59-61A/P1, dated 28 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as Proposal: Joint application - Loft floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Issues

2. I have taken the site address to be that as stated on the decision notice as this is more concise.
3. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the development comprises the erection of rear roof extensions with Juliet balconies to both flats. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host properties and surrounding area, including whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site consists of a semi-detached property which has been converted to residential flats. The proposed development would be rear roof extensions incorporating dormers with Juliette balconies over the existing two-storey outriggers to the first and second floor flat at No.59 Ellesmere Road (No.59) and No.61A Ellesmere Road (No.61A) as a joint proposal.
6. The appeal site lies within the Chiswick House Conservation Area (CA). Its significance and historic interests' rests with Chiswick House and its large grounds in the south Chiswick area. The streets around Chiswick House mainly

range from mid-19th century to the interwar period of the 20th century. These were included in the CA to protect views into and from Chiswick House and because of the high quality of the design of the houses in the area.

7. The properties within the immediate area of the appeal site are characterised as simple semi-detached properties with projecting double height bay windows and gables. Despite some variation in form, the properties in the area present a discreet arrangement that appreciably contributes towards the local character and CA.
8. The Council's Residential Extension Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), adopted 2017 at paragraph 6.2 sets out that rear dormer extensions should be of modest size and not dominate the roof. As a rule, they should be less than half the width of the original roof, set down one metre from the ridge and one metre above the eaves. Moreover, it states that large roof extensions will not be given planning permission.
9. The proposed dormers at both No.61A and No.59 would exceed more than half of the width of the original roof space. Furthermore, No.61A would completely exceed the existing original roof space and overhang the roof to the side. As such the proposed development would be unduly dominant to the roof space and would appear excessively large and bulky. It would significantly alter the appearance of the host properties, resulting in a negative visual impact and the proposed development is not considered to be good design.
10. Furthermore, the appeal proposals would excessively project from the original roof to the end of the existing outriggers and add significant additional built development to the upper floors of the properties. Given the excessive width and length of the proposals they would result in disproportionate additions and show no appreciation to the design and form of the original roofs.
11. Although the proposed development would be located to the rear it would be seen from glancing views along both Eastbourne Road and Milnthorpe Road. The roof alterations would be visible from these wider areas when viewed and appear as incongruous and excessively large additions to the roof space of both the properties. This would be to the detriment of the visual qualities of the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the CA.
12. In support of the appeal, my attention was drawn to other properties in the area that have already been extended in a similar manner to the proposals. I saw on my site visit, other properties in the vicinity of the site had roof extensions. However, these were of different design and were not comparable to the scheme before me. Furthermore, I do not have full details of these schemes and so cannot be certain that the circumstances are the same. In any case, most do not constitute examples of sympathetic development in an urban location and CA, and do not therefore justify the appeal proposal.
13. I have a duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. For the reasons given, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area and fail to preserve that of the CA. Whilst the harm would be less than substantial, I must nonetheless give this considerable importance and weight in the context of a duty to favour preservation or enhancement.

14. Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 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 including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. The appellant has put forward the argument that the proposal would have no adverse impacts, improve the quality of the area, housing and the living conditions of the users. As such in my view this would only benefit occupiers of the proposal and there would be little public benefit to outweigh the harm found to the significance of the CA.
15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host properties and surrounding area and fails to preserve or enhance the CA. It would be contrary to Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030, adopted 2015, which seeks to ensure new development conserves and enhances the character of the area, and respect the grain, scale, form, proportions and materials of the surrounding area; supports high quality urban design by refusing poor quality design and requires that all alterations and additions do not harm the existing character and appearance of the building and its context.
16. It would also be in conflict with the guidance in the Council's SPD at paragraph 6.2 relating to roof extensions.
17. I also find that the proposed development would not conserve the heritage asset in a manner appropriate to its significance, or positively contribute to local character or distinctiveness in line with the aims of the Framework, Section 16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Other Matters

18. The appellant refers to the Framework and achieving sustainable development in terms of decision making, achieving well-designed places; help raise the standard of design more generally in an area; support opportunities to use airspace above existing residential premises. Whilst this may be the case, it is caveated, including that developments are sympathetic to local character and are visually attractive.
19. Although the proposed development would not cause any harm to the living conditions of neighbouring properties including overshadowing, outlook, privacy and overlooking and the lack of objections from neighbours, these considerations do not outweigh the harm caused by the development.

Conclusion

20. Having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

KA Taylor

INSPECTOR