



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 29 July 2021 by B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/21/3267982

Upper Flat, 50 Silver Crescent, Chiswick, London W4 5SE

- 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 Anthony Wilkinson against the decision of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01021/50/P2, dated 11 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as the proposed works include alterations to the existing roof extension and minor internal changes to the layout.
-

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.

Procedural Matters

3. I was unable to view the rear of the appeal site and terrace from the rear garden, however, the appellant has provided photos and I am satisfied that the proposal can be assessed on the basis of the evidence supplied.
4. Whilst not referenced in the delegated report or reason for refusal, the Council has provided a map illustrating that the appeal site is located within the Thorney Hedge Conservation Area (CA). As such, under S72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 I am required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. Both parties have been provided with a further opportunity to make submissions in respect of this issue, and the comments received have been taken into account in this decision.
5. The Government published on 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework). Accordingly, the parties have been provided with a further opportunity to make submissions in respect of the publication. The comments received have been taken into account within the appeal decision.

Main Issues

6. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing property, surrounding area and the Thorney Hedge CA.

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. Silver Crescent is a traditional suburban street characterised by two storey Victorian terraces. Most properties have two storey rear, pitched roof outriggers set on the boundary with their neighbours. Along with the appeal property, a number of rear dormer roof extensions are apparent along the terrace.
8. The Thorney Hedge CA Character Appraisal sets out that the CA's architectural and historic interest lays with the high quality Victorian architectural detailing which is essential to the identity of the Gunnersbury part of Chiswick. Furthermore, it states that Silver Crescent appears as the most cohesive sub-group of buildings within the CA. This cohesiveness largely derives from detailing found at the frontage of the properties and the buildings within the street are identified as positive contributors to the CA.
9. The proposed extension would sit above the existing two storey outrigger, set on the boundary with No 48. Whilst not substantial in depth, the proposed roof extension would be prominently and awkwardly sited in front of the existing dormer and above the existing outrigger ridge. Its large rear window would be out of keeping with the existing pattern of fenestration and would draw attention to the incongruous addition. The extension would out of keeping with the proportions and design of the existing dwelling therefore and would appear as a dominant and obtrusive form of development which does not reflect the character or appearance of the host property or the terrace of which it forms part.
10. The appellant points to an example of a similar extension at No 54, however this appears to be an exception to the wider terrace. Moreover, I consider that this extension detracts from the character and appearance of the existing property and wider terrace. Such harmful development is not in my opinion a positive example to emulate.
11. It is acknowledged that the planning application did not receive any objections from the occupiers of neighbouring properties however this is a neutral factor which neither weighs for or against the proposal. The materials to be used are considered to be appropriate. However, this to be expected in any development and does not weigh in favour of the proposal.
12. I conclude that the proposed extension would, by reason of its siting and design, adversely affect the character and appearance of the host building and terrace. As a consequence, the contribution the host property makes to the character and appearance of the area would be reduced. Although this effect would be unlikely to be viewed from Silver Crescent, it would be apparent from the rear of neighbouring residential properties. It would, therefore, detract from the appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. The proposed development therefore conflicts with Local Plan 2015-2030 Volume One Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 which collectively seek to retain, promote and support high

quality urban design and secure development that sensitively responds to an area's character and complements the original building. It would also conflict with the guidance on extensions to outriggers and the character aims of the Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extension Guidelines (2017), and the statutory test.

13. Given the limited intervisibility within the CA as a whole I find that harm identified to the CA amounts to less than substantial, which, according to paragraph 202 of the Framework must be weighed against the public benefits.
14. The benefits of the extension, which would improve the accommodation available for the appellant, appear to be private in nature, and as such do not amount to public benefits which would outweigh the less than substantial harm that would be caused to the significance of the CA as a designated heritage asset, to which I attach great weight as required by the Framework.
15. The proposed development therefore also conflicts with the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment aims of the Framework.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. I have found that the proposal would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the benefits of the proposal and the Framework, that indicate the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore recommend that the appeal should not succeed.

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis I agree with the recommendation. The appeal is dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR