



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 20 September 2021

by Mark Ollerenshaw BSc (Hons) MTPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 October 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/21/3272685

4 Heathfield Terrace, Chiswick, London W4 4JE

- 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 Ray White against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00590/4/P10, dated 18 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'new balcony to first floor flat'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. On 20 July 2021, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published. The revised Framework does not materially alter the national policy approach in respect of the issues raised in this appeal. Since their cases would not be prejudiced, I have not consulted the main parties on the revised Framework. I have referred to the revised Framework in my findings below.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area, with particular regard to its location within the Turnham Green Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within the Turnham Green Conservation Area (CA). Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
5. Turnham Green CA is characterised by a mixture of commercial and residential premises which vary considerably in size and style. The appeal site is located on the south side of Heathfield Terrace. The significance of this part of the CA derives from its many historic buildings set within an attractive urban environment of tree lined streets, with the large open space of the green as the focal point, and a vibrant character.
6. The appeal site comprises a two storey brick built building with accommodation within the roof space. I understand that the building was originally in use as offices, but it has since been converted into flats. Set back from Heathfield

Terrace, and facing towards the green, the appeal building is a notable feature of the street scene. It is of similar design, albeit on a much smaller scale, to the building immediately to the west, 1-25 Heathfield Court. The appeal building includes a distinctive mansard roof and a regular pattern of window openings with a vertical emphasis. Overall, the building has a well-proportioned, symmetrical appearance and relatively simple form, reflecting its original office use. Although it is to some extent dominated by the larger buildings on either side of it, the appeal building is nevertheless an imposing and attractive structure which contributes positively to the character of the CA.

7. It is proposed to erect a balcony to serve the first floor flat which would be attached to, and project from, the northern elevation of the building facing towards the highway and the green beyond. The balcony would extend across three of the first floor openings, from which it would be accessed.
8. Although the proposed painted metal balustrade would allow some views through, it would nevertheless partly conceal the front elevation of the building, including the first floor window openings thereby disrupting the symmetry that currently exists between the proportions of these openings and the door openings directly below. The proposal would have an unduly fussy and cluttered appearance which would not relate well to the simple architectural form of the building. I therefore consider that the appeal proposal would be a prominent and incongruous addition to the front elevation of the building which would be visually intrusive in the street scene.
9. Whilst there are roof terraces to the second floor of the host building, these do not project forward of the building and comprise glazed screens which reduces their prominence. The adjacent Devonhurst Place and Heathfield Court contain a number of balconies positioned to the sides of the buildings which consequently are not prominent in the street scene. Heathfield Court also includes a balcony to the front elevation though this is of smaller scale than the appeal proposal. There are some similarities between the appeal proposal and the existing balcony at 10 and 11 Heathfield Terrace. However, that building is of a different design to the appeal property and the balcony appears to be of some age. It does not therefore provide a compelling precedent for the appeal proposal.
10. As a result, whilst having due regard to the other examples as a material consideration in determining this appeal, I have assessed the appeal scheme on its own merits in accordance with the requirements of the current development plan. In this context the existence of the other developments does not justify the harm I have found.
11. To conclude, the proposal would be harmful to both the character and appearance of the host property and would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the Turnham Green CA. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030, which, amongst other things, seek to achieve high design standards which respond to the wider context and conserve the character of conservation areas.
12. Paragraph 202 of the Framework states that where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimal viable use. The

proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA. It would provide the first floor flat with some outdoor amenity space which would benefit the occupiers. However, there is no evidence before me to indicate that there would be any public benefit that would outweigh the harm I have identified. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not accord with national policy outlined in the Framework, which seeks to sustain the significance of heritage assets.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other relevant material considerations, the appeal should be dismissed.

Mark Ollerenshaw

INSPECTOR