
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2020

by G Rollings BA (Hons) MAUD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/20/3248189

33 Turnham Green Terrace, Chiswick, London, W4 1RG

- 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 Daniel Thomsen (Bayley & Sage Ltd.) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01135/33/P3, dated 10 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is alterations to shopfront and replacement of a hinged entrance door for a sliding entrance door for wheelchair access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations to shopfront and replacement of a hinged entrance door for a sliding entrance door for wheelchair access at 33 Turnham Green Terrace, Chiswick, London, W4 1RG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 01135/33/P3, dated 10 October 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: Site Local Plan (A); B&S02.
 - 3) Prior to the installation of the shopfront hereby approved, details of the materials to be used shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Chiswick High Road Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. Turnham Green Terrace is a busy street with predominantly retail frontages, with the appeal site being part of a long row of single-storey buildings. The significance of this part of the Conservation Area derives from its retail-dominated uses and activity, together with the generally historic appearance of the buildings when appreciated as a whole parade. The regular pattern of shopfronts divided by pilasters, corbels and similar

facade dimensions are particularly identifiable in long views along the street, together with an absence of modern projecting signage and the presence of traditional retractable awnings open during operational hours.

4. The appeal development proposes the replacement of a traditional shopfront with one of a more modern appearance. 'Traditional features' are identified within the Council's *Shop Front Design Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document* (2013) (the SPD) as the aforementioned architectural components, together with others such as stall risers. Guideline DO3 of the SPD recommends the retention of such features as part of refurbishments, particularly in Conservation Areas.
5. The site lies directly between a row of several shopfronts to the north which have retained their traditional components, and several to the south which have modern fronts incorporating wider entrances and large glazed panels between the pavement and facades. There is a noticeable shift in the appearance of the two different parts of the parade, but the overall appearance remains united in long views for the reasons set out earlier. As such, the modification of the shopfront would not be out of character with, or at odds with this appearance of, its surroundings.
6. Nonetheless, original features of the shopfront would be removed, and the proposal thereby result in some minor harm to the appearance of the Conservation Area. Section 72 of the *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990* (the Act) requires me to give considerable weight to the presumption that preservation is desirable. The harm would be less than substantial, and paragraph 196 of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (2019) (the Framework) requires me to weigh this harm against the public benefits of the proposal. In this instance, the alteration of the shopfront would result in a significant improvement in the shop's accessibility, replacing the current narrow doorway with one that would be traversable by wheelchair users. This is a substantial benefit.
7. In weighing the duty bestowed by the Act, and the less than substantial harm against the benefits, I conclude that the benefits are greater than the minor harm caused to the appearance of the shop. The greater significance of the Conservation Area would be preserved.
8. Accordingly, I conclude that although the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, it would result in public benefits that would outweigh the harm that I have identified. The proposal would conflict with the Council's *Local Plan 2015-2030* (2015) Policies CC1, CC2 and CC4, which together require recognition of the context of the area's character, support high quality design and conserve heritage assets, amongst other considerations. However, the material considerations in this case indicate that I should decide against the development plan for the area.

Conditions and Conclusion

9. I have considered the conditions with the tests set out in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)¹. Condition No. 2 is included for the absence of

¹ PPG reference ID: 21a-003-20190723; revision date: 23 07 2019.

doubt, and No. 3 to ensure that the character and appearance of the proposed shopfront materials are in context with its surroundings.

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

G Rollings

INSPECTOR