



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2020

by Jo Dowling BA(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24th November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/Y/20/3252740

21 Priory Avenue, London W4 1TZ

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Paul Goacher against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00899/21/L11, dated 18 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 January 2020.
 - The works proposed are creation of a new single door opening between existing side garage and entrance hallway.
-

Decision

1. This appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for the creation of a new single door opening between existing side garage and entrance hallway at 21 Priory Avenue, London W4 1TZ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 00899/21/L11 dated 18 November 2019 subject to the following conditions:
 1. The works to which this consent relates, must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this consent.
 2. The works hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: PL100.
 3. All new internal works, including works of making good, shall match the original work in both type, colour and dimensions of materials and in detailed execution.
 4. No works shall take place until details of the design of the door and architrave in drawings at scale of 1:10 or 1:20 have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve a Grade II listed building, 21 Priory Avenue, and any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

3. 21 Priory Avenue is a three-storey detached house located within the Bedford Park Conservation Area. The property is constructed of terracotta brick with partial tile hanging. The front elevation has a Dutch gabled front with a two-

storey bay window. A later single storey brick garage with tiled pitched roofed is located to the side of the property and there are further side and rear extensions. The house is a good example of Queen Anne revival. It forms part of the wider Bedford Park Conservation Area which is characterised by semi-detached and detached houses that are set closely together so that they read as a longer composition on the street. Whilst there is a wide variety of designs the use of consistent architectural language and a similar palette of materials gives the area its distinctive character and appearance.

4. I agree with the Council that part of the significance of No. 21 as a listed building lies in its plan form. However, I note from my site visit that while many original features remain, the ground floor has been extensively altered. The kitchen, which would originally have been positioned in the smaller middle room and the dining room which would have been at the rear overlooking the garden have swapped positions. The layout has been further altered through the addition of a conservatory to the rear and extensions to either side. Significant openings have been formed in the original external walls to allow these additional internal areas to flow into the original floor space.
5. While the new door opening proposed between the entrance hall and the garage, itself an extension, would result in the loss of some of the original fabric, in the context of the extensive changes already wrought to the ground floor, set out above, I consider that it would have no harmful impact on the plan form of the house, or, as a result, the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building, or its significance, or the character or appearance, or significance of the Bedford Park Conservation Area.
6. The proposal would therefore comply with policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan (2016) and policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (2015) which seek to conserve and enhance the character and appearance of an area and the heritage assets that it contains. These policies reflect the advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Furthermore, Hounslow's Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2017) states that there may be scope for openings in original walls but that these should be modest.

Conditions

7. The Framework sets out a number of tests that conditions need to meet. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council and unless otherwise stated judge that they meet the tests. Where necessary for clarity or enforceability I have re-ordered them or adjusted the wording. In addition to the standard time limit in the interest of enforceability I have imposed a condition requiring the works to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
8. Given that the works are to a listed building I consider that a condition requiring the works to match existing is necessary. Furthermore, the scale of the plans submitted and the level of detail that they contain is limited and as a result I consider the imposition of a condition requiring the submission of further detail at a larger scale necessary to ensure that the new door and surround matches the existing doors.

Conclusion

9. Accordingly, for the reasons set out and subject to the conditions discussed I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Jo Dowling

INSPECTOR