
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 October 2020

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3251985

8 Chatsworth Road, London W4 3HY

- 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 Bateh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00237/8/P5, dated 10 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single story timber orangery.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey timber orangery at 8 Chatsworth Road, London W4 3HY in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 00237/8/P5, dated 10 January 2020 subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision.

Procedural matter

2. The position of the proposed orangery shown on the Block Plan (ref 11647/03) is incorrect because is depicted at the rear of the main house. The drawing entitled *Plans and Elevations* (ref 11647/02) shows the new addition projecting from the existing rear extension of No 8, which is consistent with the rest of the evidence before me. I have assessed the proposal on that basis.

Main issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area and on the living conditions of the occupiers of 6 Chatsworth Road with particular regard to light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The proposal is to erect a single storey orangery at the rear of the appeal dwelling, which is a substantial detached house within a predominantly residential area. It falls within the Chiswick House Conservation Area (CA), which derives its significance as a heritage asset primarily from Chiswick House and its landscaped grounds. Among the pressures on the CA that are identified in the statement entitled *Chiswick House and Surrounding Area* is the creeping loss of spaciousness and architectural integrity in the form of large extensions.
5. By projecting outwards from the existing rear extension, the proposal would further enlarge the built footprint of No 8 and add to the scale and mass of the

house. The cumulative length of the existing and proposed rear extensions would exceed the maximum threshold of 4.25m identified in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, *Residential Extension Guidelines* (SPD).

6. However, in this case, the overall size of the proposal would not be evident from any single direction. From the large back garden, the appeal scheme would appear as subservient in height, scale and form to the existing house beyond it. The enlarged house would continue to stand within a good-sized plot with no noticeable reduction to the spacious feel at the back of the property. None of the new extension would be seen from the road. Glimpses of the upper parts of the proposal possible from the adjacent properties would give little indication of the overall size of the appeal scheme. Furthermore, the extension would be of matching external materials and the pattern of openings would be keeping with the style and appearance of the host building. ^[1]_{SEP}
7. Having regard to all these matters, the house once enlarged would have an acceptable overall appearance. It would have been significantly changed at the rear. However, taken as a whole, the enlarged building would be of a high standard design that would be in keeping with the qualities and character of a large house that has a relatively distinguished appearance.
8. Little of the proposal would be seen from beyond the back garden of No 8 given the mature planting within and around the boundaries of the appeal dwelling. Given this visual containment, the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area, nearby properties and the CA would not be harmful. The character and appearance of the CA would be preserved.

Living conditions

9. The flank wall of the proposal would be close to the shared rear boundary with 6 Chatsworth Road. It would also project above the fence and hedgerow that mark the common boundary between the site and this adjacent property. As a result, there would be some loss of natural light to the rear of No 6 later in the day with the new built form in place. However, the main source of natural lighting to the rear of No 6 would not be significantly affected.
10. The new sidewall would further enclose the back garden of No 6 nearest to the main house and the proposal is likely to be visible from both here and through the rear windows. Nevertheless, there is already a fence and tall hedge along this common boundary. Whilst this is not permanent, I attach some weight to the presence of a substantial feature between Nos 6 and 8. The proposal would be in close proximity to this neighbouring property but neither its scale, height nor its depth would unduly dominate outlook. Hence the living conditions of the occupiers of No 6 would not be materially reduced.

Conclusion on the main issues

11. On the main issues I conclude that the proposed development would not significantly harm the character or appearance of the local area or the living conditions of the occupiers of No 6. Therefore, I find no conflict with Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the Council's Local Plan 2015-2030 and the SPD. These policies and guidance seek to ensure that residential alterations complement the original building and that new development promotes high quality design; conserves or enhances the historic environment; and safeguards residential amenity.

12. Reference is made to other extensions to properties along Chatsworth Road, which the appellant considers to set a precedent. None of the examples given replicate the circumstances in this case and so very few, if any, direct parallels can be drawn between them and the appeal scheme. In any event, each proposal should be assessed on its own merits, which I have done.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings and to require that the development is carried out in accordance with them as this provides certainty. The Block Plan (ref 11647/02) is omitted from the list because the position of the new orangery shown on that drawing is incorrect. A condition to require that the external materials match those of the existing building is required to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR

Schedule of 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: Refs 11647/01, 11647/02 and 11647/04.
- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.