



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 16 November 2020

by M Chalk BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3257794

43 Woodlands Road, Isleworth, TW7 6JT

- 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 Mrs Siobhan Knight against the decision of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01230/43/P2, dated 5 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as ground and first floor side extension replacing existing garage and outbuilding and loft conversion to house with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. At the time of my site visit construction was underway on previously approved extensions to the appeal property. That earlier approval included a single-storey rear extension across the full width of the house, and the Council has not objected to this same element of the appeal proposal. The appeal has been determined accordingly.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is whether the development proposed would preserve the character or appearance of the Woodlands Grove Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is on the edge of the Woodlands Grove Conservation Area (the CA). The significance of the CA derives from its spectrum of architectural styles, and its retained historic layout.
5. The appeal property occupies a prominent corner plot, with views along Woodlands onto its side elevation, as well as the front elevation being visible both in Woodlands Road and from Riverside Walk.
6. The development proposed would substantially increase the mass of the appeal property beyond that previously approved. The roof would appear incongruous within the street scene due to the combination of the increased width, lowered ridgeline and gable end, and it would unbalance this pair of semi-detached properties. Furthermore, the width of the rear dormer would result in it being an inappropriately bulky and dominant addition to the rear roof slope of the property, especially prominent in views from neighbouring properties within the CA.

7. Many properties in Woodlands Road, Woodland Gardens and Riverside Walk comprise unbalanced pairs of semi-detached houses where one house has converted a hipped roof to a gabled roof. Some of these properties are seen together with the appeal site as part of the same street scene. However, the properties on these streets to which my attention was drawn all lie outside of the CA. While they may affect the setting of the CA, this limits the weight attached to these examples in the determination of this appeal.
8. The two-storey side extension would be flush with the existing front building line at ground-floor level. Council guidance advises against this on a corner plot, but the appeal property does not occupy the corner plot directly on the junction of Woodlands Road and Riverside Walk. Within the section of Woodlands Road from No 43 to the junction Sussex Road there are multiple instances of ground floor or two-storey side extensions set flush or projecting beyond the original front elevation. The appeal property is on the edge of the CA, and the proposed ground-floor element of the side extension would not be a prominent feature of the site due to the boundary treatment to the appeal site and No 41, which occupies the corner plot. Given this context, this element of the appeal proposal would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the house or the CA.
9. However, the development proposed would overall fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. The harm to the CA would be experienced primarily in the immediate vicinity of the site due to the proposed extensions to the roof of the appeal property. It would amount to less than substantial harm when weighed against the significance of the CA as a whole.
10. The appeal proposal would result in an enlarged house and improved accommodation for the appellant. However, this would principally be a private rather than a public benefit, and therefore attracts limited weight. Great weight must be accorded to the conservation of designated heritage assets in accordance with Paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework irrespective of the degree of harm that would result from a development. In this instance the benefits identified as arising from the development proposed would not outweigh the harm to the significance of the CA.
11. For the reasons set out above the appeal proposal would conflict with Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030. These policies require, amongst other things, that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm will be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, the appeal fails.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR