
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2020

by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/20/3248509

12 (flat 1) & 14 Harvard Road, Chiswick, London W4 4EA

- 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 and Mrs Nutkins against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00571/12-14/P2, dated 22 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a joint application (12 & 14 Harvard Road) for rear and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for development described as a joint application (12 & 14 Harvard Road) for rear and side extension at 12 (flat 1) & 14 Harvard Road, Chiswick, London W4 4EA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00571/12-14/P2, dated 22 November 2019, subject to the following 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, reference PL01A, PL02, PL03 (side elevations) and PL04.
 - 3) The materials and finishes to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the appeal scheme would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Wellesley Road Conservation Area (WRCA).

Reasons

3. The appeal scheme concerns the rear elevation of two mid terrace three storey buildings. They are of a traditional scale and design with every other pair being also joined at the rear by a hipped roof two storey outrigger extension. The proposed extension would be at single storey and span the ground floor of both buildings. There is currently a conservatory projecting rearwards from the outrigger on No 12 and a lean to extension and retractable awning attached to the side and rear of No 14s outrigger respectively.

4. In spanning both buildings, the extensions would wrap around the traditional outriggers of each. Some of their legibility would therefore be reduced, as well as an element of their even rhythm being interrupted. That said, the outriggers, at single storey specifically, are currently incumbered by more than one addition and extension. In the case of No 14, the appearance of the lean to already 'fills in' the recessed part of the rear elevation, diluting the original building's shape. In addition, the holistic design approach of the extensions, when viewed together, brings some coherence to the rear elevations of each building, removing the somewhat mismatched appearance of the existing ones, when taking into account the awning, lean to side extension and conservatory.
5. The Council have explained that the wrap around nature of the proposed extensions would conflict with section 6.1 of the Residential Extension Guidelines 2017. Amongst other things, the guidelines suggest that wrap around extensions on an original rear projection in a conservation area will generally be refused. Be this as it may, conflict with guidelines is not the same as conflict with the development plan. In addition, each development proposal is considered on its own merits, with regard to its context, and as I have explained above this would not give rise to harm. Ultimately, the guidelines do not rule out extensions of the type in the appeal scheme entirely, stating that they will generally (my emphasis) be refused.
6. With the above in mind, the proposed development would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the WRCA. It would accordingly be preserved. This would ensure the appeal scheme would be in accordance with Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the Local Plan¹. Amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that new development, extensions to dwellings specifically, is of a high quality and contextually appropriate design and appearance that creates attractive places. They also aim to conserve and take opportunities to enhance the significance of the borough's heritage assets.

Conditions

7. I have imposed conditions pertaining to the timescale for the commencement of works and specifying the plans to which the appeal scheme relates in the interests of both clarity and enforceability. I have also imposed a condition, in the interests of a good quality finish, setting out materials and finishes to match the existing dwelling. The Council have suggested a condition limiting the hours for construction. Whilst I see the merit of such a condition, I do not consider it to be justified for what is a contextually small construction project, which would have an equally small and time limited impact. Given they are works concerned with occupied dwellings, I would not anticipate them to be taking place during unsociable hours. I have not therefore imposed this condition.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons and subject to the conditions I have set out above, the appeal is allowed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR

¹ London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan Volume One 2015-2030