
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2022

by Martin Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/21/3280863

5 Devonshire Road, London, W4 2EU

- 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 Praneet Shivaprasad against the decision of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00354/5/P5, received by the Council 8 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear addition of extension to bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear addition of extension to bedroom at 5 Devonshire Road, London, W4 2EU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00354/5/P5, received by the Council 8 April 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Numbers 1354.00, 1354.101 & 1354.102
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) No demolition or construction work shall take place on the site except between the hours of 8:00am to 6:00pm on Mondays to Friday and 9:00am to 1:00pm on Saturdays and none shall take place on Sundays or Public Holidays.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on (i) the character and appearance of the area, bearing in mind the sites location within the Chiswick High Road Conservation Area, and (ii) the living conditions of nearby occupiers, with particular regard to any overbearing effect.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The site is located within the Chiswick High Road Conservation Area. I observed that the significance of this designated heritage asset lies, in part, in the quality of the generally commercial premises fronting the streets forming the

High Road and other perpendicular roads. This creates an attractive and vibrant streetscene.

4. The appeal scheme proposes the construction of a flat-roofed addition in the place of an existing enclosed balcony area, stretching the width of the existing rear outrigger. The extension would not rise beyond the first floor of the outrigger, an existing second storey being above, and as such would appear as a subservient element. I am conscious that the Council highlight that Residential Extension Guidelines states that the width of a first-floor extension should not be greater than the width of half of the building, which the outrigger already is. However, given that the extension would mimic the width of the outrigger and would not appear to dominate it, I find good reason in this case for departing from this general advice.
5. Given the location of the appeal site, the proposed extension would be visible from Prince of Wales Terrace. However, it would be viewed within the mixed context of the rear of existing commercial properties, which contain a variety of additions that are commercial in nature i.e., extraction systems. Moreover, there is an addition, rising to a greater height further along the terrace, which the proposal would be viewed against. Within this context, the proposal would not be overly prominent but would be viewed as an appropriately sized and sited addition to the rear of the terrace.
6. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area, including preserving the significance of the Chiswick High Road Conservation Area as a designated heritage asset. Therefore, the proposal accords with policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (the Local Plan). Together, and amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that development pays due regard to context, responds to a sites' characteristics, conserves heritage assets and that extensions to buildings do not harm the building or its context.

Living conditions

7. The extension would be constructed above an existing single storey element and extend to the existing boundary of the building. In this respect it would increase the bulk visible to the rear of the property, although this would be tempered by the use of a flat roof. While the mews onto which the extension would adjoin is narrow, it is predominantly occupied by further commercial properties, some of which are linked to those in the existing terrace of which the appeal site forms part.
8. The proposed increase in bulk at the appeal site would be viewed within the context of the existing rear elevation of the terrace which already rises to three-storeys in height, and those properties along the mews. It would not be so dominant as to be overbearing, or to result in any unacceptable effect, on nearby occupiers, particularly as the Council highlight that the nearest residential property is not directly behind the appeal site, but further along the mews.
9. I note that the Council makes reference to the likely continuing trend of the conversion of buildings along the mews to residential uses, however the acceptability of any scheme that comes forward in the future for such development would need to be considered in light of the circumstances existing at that time.

10. I therefore find that there would be no unacceptable effect on the living conditions of nearby occupiers, due to any overbearing effect. Thus, the proposal complies with policy SC7 of the Local Plan, insofar as it seeks to ensure that development minimises harm to neighbouring residents.

Conditions

11. In the interests of certainty, I have imposed a plans condition to define the approved drawings. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area I have also imposed a condition in respect of matching materials. Additionally, due to the close proximity of other occupiers and to protect their living conditions, I have imposed a condition in respect of construction hours.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Martin Allen

INSPECTOR