



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2021

by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3260673

33 Staveley Road, Chiswick, London W4 3HU

- 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 Hannah Winter against the decision of Council of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01069/33/P5 dated 12 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of a part single part two story rear extension including new roof lights, and a two storey side infill extension to existing dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a part single part two story rear extension including new roof lights, and a two storey side infill extension to existing dwelling house at 33 Staveley Road, Chiswick, London W4 3HU in accordance with the terms of the application ref: 01069/33/P5, dated 12 May 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development to which this permission relates shall be begun within a period of three years commencing on the date of this decision;
 - 2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2001 EX00, 2001 PA01, 2001 PA02, 2001 PA03, 2001 PA04, 2001 PA05 and 2001 PA06.
 - 3) No 'above-ground' building works shall proceed above damp-proof course level or equivalent until a schedule and samples of all bricks, tiles and other materials to be used in the external elevations 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;
 - 4) No demolition or construction work shall take place on the site except between the hours of 08:00 to 16:00 on Mondays to Friday and 09:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays and none shall take place on Sundays and Public Holidays without the prior agreement of the Local Planning Authority.

Procedural Matters

2. Appeal APP/F5540/D/20/3260674 was determined at the same time following the same site visit, however, they are classed as two standalone (not linked) cases. I note that it is contended by the appellant that the proposals should be considered together, however, they were originally submitted as separate applications. The proposals are considered on their own merits and the appeal decisions are separate.

3. Whilst the appellant's submissions seem to suggest and/or cover an argument relating to issue with potential impact on neighbouring properties amenity, I have no evidence before me to suggest that this is an issue nor does it form part of the Council's reasons for refusal. The main issue, to be considered, is that as outlined below.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the character of the host dwelling and surrounding dwellings and the character and appearance of the Chiswick House Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a 1920s semi-detached residential dwelling which is located in a residential area. The site stands within the Chiswick House Conservation Area (CA). The property has already had a single storey extension to the rear. The appeal site also benefits from rear and side dormers so has already undergone a relative amount of alteration when viewed from the rear elevation, as have neighbouring properties.
6. The Council confirms in their delegated report that the two storey element for the rear extension is broadly in line with Residential Extension Guidelines and that the two storey element of the side infill would be of modest scale. Whilst this element of their assessment is acknowledged to relate to neighbouring amenity it is difficult to see how a proposal which is broadly in line with extension guidelines can then be assessed as generally inappropriate in size or position.
7. The Council acknowledge that the existing rear extension would be replaced by the proposed rear extension. I note there would be a small difference in depth (approximately 0.6m) which would match the single storey extension at the neighbouring property (no. 31). The main "additions" to the host property, above the existing rear extension, would be the part two-storey and side infill elements of the proposal. I acknowledge the combination of the proposals would be a dominant feature compared to the host property, and it would alter the appearance of the rear elevation, but I do not find that overall this results in harm or impact upon the character of the host property which is significant enough to warrant refusal.
8. Importantly, I find that the front of the property remains largely unaltered within the proposals. The size of the extensions would be suitable for the scale of the host property and would be visually acceptable in the context of the host property and other development within the surrounding area. The flat roof proposal is acknowledged to be modern in design but I do not find this to be negative or intrusive. I do not find the host dwelling of sufficient architectural merit to warrant replication in subsequent alterations or extensions.
9. The modern design differentiates between the original property and the extensions which I find, combined with the preservation of the front elevation, to be positive in preserving the overall character of the host dwelling rather than engulfing and/or losing it within something which seeks to replicate the existing design. Furthermore the adjoining properties are noted to have equally as bold rear extensions, particularly in the roof, which means I do not

find the proposal at the appeal site would be out of scale or character with surrounding dwellings.

10. From my walk down Staveley Road, I noted that a number of properties have been altered and extended which I find means that there is not a strong uniform character between the dwellings within the CA and this not, it would appear, adequately reflected in the CA appraisal which is many years old. There is also a wide variation of property styles, including more modern flatted development. The Council have not provided robust evidence of any assessment of actual impact of the proposed development on the significance of the designated heritage asset as required within the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.
11. The extensions to the rear would be limited in views from the public realm and wider views within, in and out of the CA given the site context including the established vegetation and trees to the rear of the appeal site. In addition to this the orientation of the properties along Sutton Court Road means that even private views of the appeal site, within the CA, would be limited. In considering the views from Staveley Road the side extension would take the host property's built form to the site boundary but it would commence a notable distance back from the front elevation.
12. When viewed from the front elevation the proposal would alter the appearance of the property from the street scene and reduce the visual separation between the appeal site and no. 31. Despite this I find the impact to be negligible due to the set back of the side extension from both the road and front elevation of the host property. This means it would only be visible in direct views when stood in front of the host property. The height and set-back would mean it presents as a subservient addition from the front elevation where the original features and character of the host dwelling would remain dominant in public views. It is further shielded by a mature tree in the front garden. I find that there would be no real impact upon the appearance of the CA and there would be no impact upon Chiswick House and its surrounding grounds.
13. Given the lack of change to the front of the property and its setting within the street scene, the highly varied property styles and varied extensions within the immediate area I do not find merit in shying away from more modern design. The appellant has submitted evidence of more contemporary design and larger areas of glazing in the area. The Council have not responded to evidence otherwise. I find that the proposals would sit acceptably in their visual and spatial contexts without harming the character of the host property nor the character and appearance of the CA as a whole. The character and appearance of the CA would therefore be preserved.
14. The proposal would be consistent with London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 (LP) Policy CC1 which requires development to respond to the wider context and history of the area and LP Policy CC2 which requires proposals to respond meaningfully to the site and its characteristics. The proposal would also be consistent with LP Policy CC4 which requires any development within a CA to conserve and take opportunities to enhance the character of the area and LP Policy SC7 which requires that alterations and additions do not harm the existing character of the building and its context and expects development to harmonise with adjoining properties and maintain the character of the general street scene.

Other Matters

15. I note an objection, from the neighbouring property at no. 31, which raises concern with impact on light into the property. I have dealt with the character of the area earlier within this decision. The Council have considered matters relating to loss of light, privacy and outlook within their assessment of the proposal and have not included this as a reason for refusal. I have no evidence before me to conclude differently. Matters such as fire escape are considered and controlled through Building Regulations.

Conditions

16. The Council has suggested one condition within this appeal but I find it appropriate, for the reasons outlined, to add further conditions on the consent granted. A condition requiring the development to be in accordance with the approved plans is required in order to control and define the development which is granted consent. A time condition is attached to comply with section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance, I have attached a condition requiring approval of the materials for the external elevations. To protect neighbouring residential amenity during construction a condition limiting timings of construction works is required.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons outlined above, and taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

Eleni Randle

INSPECTOR