



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 March 2021 by Ms S Maur

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/21/3267161

Site Address: 17 Thornbury Road, Isleworth TW7 4HQ

- 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 Lasitha Perera, against the decision of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01119/17/P2, dated 31 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a "locally listed home extension at ground level, fence and protection of dwells against falls".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Spring Grove Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The property is a two-storey detached house with pitched gabled roofs, located on the corner of Thornbury Road and Clifton Road. The house is of a high quality with a distinct design. It is locally listed and set within the Spring Grove Conservation Area. The site has a pleasant character and lies within an urban, but predominately, residential setting. The dwelling has London stock brick walls with red brick dressings, herringbone pattern brick work with gables and projecting eaves. The dwelling has an open frontage and a low boundary treatment and appears centrally as a focal point next to the roundabout. The site is therefore highly visible. The largely open nature of the site, prominence of the building and its distinctive design are significant features of this part of the Conservation Area.
5. The proposal consists of the demolition of the existing kitchen and front gable, and the erection of a flat roof single storey extension. It would be of varying heights and extend up to the existing brick boundary, following the angle of this wall. The proposal also includes a metal fence.

6. Due to its height and design, with the relatively small gaps between the railings, the metal fence would significantly reduce the open character of the site and would appear as a dominant feature. It would contrast with, rather than compliment, the locally listed building. Although this would make a distinction between new and old, due to the open boundary and the site's prominent location, the fence would detract from the buildings setting. This would therefore not relate to its context and would not sit comfortably with the existing character.
7. The proposed extension would have a flat roof which would extend beyond the front of the retained building frontage and to the front of part of the building. Due to the prominence and the special architectural quality of the gable roofs on the property, the flat roof would cause an uncomfortable contrast. The proposed extension would merge with the existing brick wall boundary, which would cause an uncomfortable positioning and shape in relation to the existing building.
8. The flat roof single storey extension would incorporate varying roof heights, where the highest part of the extension would be of a significant scale. Although the proposed height and width would be less than the main house, the side extension would dominate the host dwelling, which would be accentuated by the open boundary and prominence of the host building. The large glazed façade would appear dominant and due to its positioning, partly to the front of the original building, it would not integrate with the historic character of the host building. The brick type proposed would match the existing building, however this would not mitigate the harm. Although a contemporary approach to extending historic buildings can be appropriate, for the above reasons, this proposal would result in harm.
9. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. The National Planning Policy Framework also requires that great weight be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets.
10. Due to the scale of the development and that it would only be seen from a small part of the Conservation Area, the proposal would cause less than substantial harm. However, no substantive public benefits have been put forward to weigh against this harm.
11. In light of the above, it is concluded the development would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Spring Grove Conservation Area. This would be contrary to Policies SC7, CC1, CC2 and CC4 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 volume one (Local Plan). Together these seek to conserve and enhance heritage assets as a means of supporting an area's distinctive character and appearance.

Other Matters

12. There would be benefits of a more private garden, a new shower room at ground floor and potential for a ground floor bedroom. These would be private benefits and relate only to a single household, as such these should only attract minimal weight and not outweigh the harm that would be caused by the proposed development. Although the appellant is open to changing the fence design, the appeal must be considered on the basis of the submitted material.

13. I have noted and taken account of the concerns raised about the handling of the application and pre-application in terms of engagement and potential inaccuracies in the report, as well as the lack of objection from neighbours and consultees. However, these matters are not fundamental to the planning merits of the case.
14. Although the proposal meets some of the criteria of some of the relevant Policies within The Local Plan, and some of the advice in the Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2017 overall, the development would result in harm for the reasons given above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ms S Maur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR