
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2020

by Jonathon Parsons MSc BSc(Hons) DipTP Cert(Urb) MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/20/3247120

58B Wellesley Road, Chiswick, London W4 4AD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the development of land without complying with conditions to which a previous planning permission was granted.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Scot Drummond against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01177/58B/P12, dated 16 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 December 2019.
 - The application sought planning permission for a roof extension and associated alterations without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref 01177/58B/P11 dated 21 May 2019.
 - The condition in dispute is No 2 which states that: The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 11802-01-01; 11802-PA-01, 11802-04-01, 11802-04-02, 11802-04-03, 11802-04-04, 11802-SK-01, 11802-SK-02, 11802-SK-03, 11802-SK04, 11802-SK-05.
 - The reasons given for the condition is: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Under 01177/58B/P11, planning permission was granted for a roof extension and alterations at 58B Wellesley Road. Condition 2 specified that the development should be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Under 01177/58B/P12, the appeal proposal seeks the removal of this condition and in effect, its replacement with a condition specifying that the condition should be carried out in accordance with substitute plans. The substitute plans show a similar but higher roof extension. The height of extension would increase by approximately 1.5m.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether in removing the condition, the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or the appearance of the Wellesley Road Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a two storey retail and commercial building with additional floorspace within an pitched and single dormer roof. The appeal

property fronts onto Wellesley Road. Behind and to the side of the site, there is a rear pedestrian way and beyond this, the elevated A4 Great West Road (M4). Due to the roughly triangular shape of the site, the pedestrian way and road wrap around the back of it. On the other side of the site, there is a lower storey garage building and yard. The surrounding area comprises flats opposite, a public house and high storey buildings, mostly residential. The site and much of the immediately surrounding area are within the Wellesley Road Conservation Area.

5. As the site lies within a Conservation Area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The Conservation Area has an attractive mid to late nineteenth century townscape, primarily detached villas, semi-detached residential properties and terraces along and in the streets on either side of Wellesley Road. Features include decorative surrounds to recessed porches and windows, sash windows, projecting eaves and chimneys. These historic and architectural qualities form defining characteristics and are of significance and value, and are of special interest to the Conservation Area.
6. The existing building is a much later addition to the streetscene with less attractive construction features. The existing pitch roof appears as a cumbersome and awkward feature mainly due to its construction across a building that is irregular in shape. This is particularly apparent from the front and when approaching from the east. Overall, it provides a negative contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
7. The proposal would replace the roof of the appeal building with a modern flat-roofed extension that would cover much of its footprint. Above new brickwork and a reconstituted stone string, there would be facing render and glazing, with a protruding aluminium fascia and flat roof above. The extension would have a distinctive curved section of glazing at the corner of the building close to Wellesley Road and the elevated A4 Great West Road. The detailed aesthetics of this design would not be unattractive.
8. However, the overall height of the additional storey would be substantial. It would appear significantly greater than that of the individual storeys below. As a result, it would have considerable scale and bulk at the roof level which would make it appear noticeably top heavy in relation to the building. In relation to the existing roof, such an extension would have a far greater negative impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and its significance. It would be far greater in scale and bulk than the existing roof.
9. An appeal was allowed for a similarly designed roof extension in 2019. However, this was for a smaller sized roof extension which the Inspector found to be a not overly dominant element in relation to the existing building. The proposal before me is approximately 1.5m higher than that considered by the previous Inspector. For the reasons given above, this would result in a building that would markedly stand out and detract from the more traditional form of development predominant in the Conservation Area.
10. The previous Inspector commented on the building's existing roof appearing as a very heavy and incongruous feature. In my assessment, the negative impact of the existing roof has been considered not to be as adverse. Nevertheless, there is an element of subjectivity in any such assessment and even if I had formed a similar view, the greater scale and bulk of the proposed development

before me would be harmful. In any case, this previous appeal decision demonstrates that every proposal must be determined on its individual merits, taking into account the nature of the scheme being considered.

11. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, the type of harm identified above would be less than substantial. It is necessary that this identified harm is weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this regard, the proposal would provide office space providing a business and economic benefit. However, the benefit is limited by reason of the proposal expanding existing floorspace. Furthermore, this benefit has to be balanced against the adverse impact on the significance of the Conservation Area for which considerable importance and weight is required to be attached. Thus, the harm to the significance of the Conservation Area would outweigh the scheme's benefits.
12. For all these reasons, the development would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and CC4 of the Hounslow Council Local Plan 2015-2030 which collectively and amongst other matters, seeks to retain, promote and support high quality urban design and architecture to create attractive, distinctive and liveable spaces, and conserve and enhance the Borough's heritage assets.

Conclusion

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

Jonathon Parsons

INSPECTOR