



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 1 June 2020

by B Davies MSc FGS CGeol

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 June 2020

Appeal A Ref: APP/F5540/W/20/3246637

40 & 42 Ellesmere Road, Chiswick, London, W4 4QH

- 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 M. Campbell against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00392/40-42/P1, dated 19 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of a two-storey side extension, single storey side/rear extension and roof extension (roof extension over both nos 40 & 42) with balconies to front and rear, provision for cycle and refuse storage and conversion of No. 42 into five self-contained flats.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/F5540/W/20/3251354

40 & 42 Ellesmere Road, Chiswick, London, W4 4QH

- 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 M. Campbell against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00392/40-42/P2, dated 15 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single part two-storey side extension, a single storey rear extension and a roof extension with balconies to front and rear to allow for the conversion into five self-contained flats with provision for cycle and refuse storage. Erection of a roof extension with balconies to front and rear at 40 Ellesmere Road to match 42.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Procedural matters

3. As set out above there are two appeals on this site. They differ only in the configuration of the roof extension. I have considered each proposal on its individual merits. However, to avoid duplication I have dealt with the two schemes together, except where otherwise indicated.

Main issue

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

Reasons

5. The site comprises a matching pair of two-storey, semi-detached houses built in the art deco style. The front elevation and windows are deeply curved towards a recessed entrance, and the building has a characteristic flat roof and white rendered finish. The front roofline is distinctive, exhibiting a parapet that reflects the curved structure below, in addition to symmetrical chimneys and pillar features on opposing ends of the front elevation. There is a small structure in the centre of the roof housing a stairwell for access to the roof terrace. The bulk of this is reduced through use of a partially glazed gable roof, flattened at the top in sympathy with the form of the underlying host building. The rear and sides of the roof are edged by horizontal metal railings, which at No 42 have been backed with different heights of generally white coloured board and fencing.
6. The building has been 'locally listed' since the original application and is therefore a non-designated heritage asset. The listing was on the basis that the building is a good example of art deco architecture, which is not typical in this section of the borough. The characteristic aspects of the building identified in the listing are general to this architectural style, including reference to the flat roof and white render.
7. The building fronts a six-lane carriageway and is visible from this direction, although partially screened by trees and most likely to be viewed from a moving vehicle. The side and rear face a quiet, tree-lined residential area and as the site is on a corner plot it is clearly visible from both these directions.
8. All proposed alterations to No 42 have extant permission¹ with the exception of the roof. Both current proposals incorporate a roof extension across both buildings, adding a fifth flat at No 42 and additional living space at No 40. I have considered the development as a whole, but the focus of this decision is necessarily on the roof, given that the remainder already has permission and I consider is likely to be built.
9. Appeal A is for an approximately rectangular roof structure immediately inside the parapet, which would truncate the curves of the underlying building and subsume the distinctive roofline, including chimneys and pillars at the front. At the side and rear, the original roofline would be replaced by a large, box like structure that would be windowless to the side. It would be a dominant, bulky and incongruent addition to the host building, exacerbated by its prominence in the surrounding area. The proposed dark grey, vertical timber cladding does not reference the characteristic colour or materials of either the host house or the surrounding area. The fenestration of the front of the extension has not taken cues from the distinctive windows of the host building and would appear incongruent and discordant.
10. This is a joint venture, meaning that the essential symmetry across the host building would be preserved, a flat roof structure would be retained, the unattractive boarding removed, and the building would remain slightly lower

¹ 00392/42/P2 (September 2018) and 00392/42/P3 (April 2019)

than the neighbouring house. However, these benefits are not sufficient to outweigh the harm to character and appearance of the host building identified above.

11. I have also considered the proposal to colour the roof extension dark grey to contrast with and highlight the original white structure in the foreground and, while there is some merit in this argument, this is not sufficient to overcome the inappropriate use of materials and incongruous form. There is an existing roof structure of similar height, but unlike the proposal, it has a small footprint and I do not consider that this establishes a precedent for an additional level. I have also noted the appellant's argument that a tolerance for further interventions has been created through the recent permission for side and rear extensions, but I do not find this to be the case because they are less prominent when viewed from the public domain and, unlike the current proposal, do not significantly disrupt the architecturally important front elevation.
12. For the reasons above, the proposal in Appeal A is therefore in conflict with Policy CC4 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015-2030), which requires that development is in keeping with key aspects of locally listed buildings and preserves the special architectural quality through use of sympathetic design and materials. It is also in conflict with Policies CC1 and CC2 of the Local Plan, which seek to conserve and enhance the special qualities and heritage of an area.
13. Appeal B is for a smaller roof extension set back further from the parapet walls. It incorporates curved corners, redesigned windows and retains more original architectural detailing, including the rear fin and chimneys, and it would be a more subservient and sympathetic addition. However, the front elevation of the extension would still be sufficiently far forward to dominate and detract from the distinctive roofline, although extension of the chimneys counters this effect slightly. The curves of the extension, while softening the impact, do not reflect the strong underlying structure of a deep curve around the entrance and squared corners elsewhere. The proposed finishing materials of vertical zinc cladding would be inappropriate for the same reasons as grey timber cladding above. Overall, I find the extension proposed in Appeal B unsympathetic to the host building.
14. In not preserving the special architectural quality of the building through use of sympathetic design and materials, I therefore also find that the proposal in Appeal B conflicts with Policies CC1, CC2 and CC4 of the Local Plan.

Other matters

15. Appeal B was also refused because an energy statement had not been submitted with the proposal to demonstrate compliance with the carbon dioxide reduction targets, with reference to Policy EQ1 of the Local Plan and Policies 5.2 and 5.3 of the London Plan (2016).
16. Policy EQ1 of the Local Plan requires that all developments meet the carbon emission reduction requirements set out in the London Plan. Read as a whole, Policy 5.2 (C) of the London Plan requires that a detailed energy assessment is included with proposals for major development, which this development does not constitute. Policy 5.2 (A) requires that all proposals make the fullest contribution to minimising emissions, and in this case, the Planning Design and

Access Statement commits to achieving appropriate reductions in emissions, the details of which could be secured by condition, if necessary.

17. Policy 5.3 of the London Plan requires that sustainable design standards are integral to every development and as the Council have indicated that this could be secured by condition, I have not considered this further.
18. The development would provide a flat on the open market in addition to those already given permission. Whilst this would be a positive contribution to housing supply, the benefit from a single flat is limited.

Conclusion

19. For these reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Davies

INSPECTOR