



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2022

by E Dade BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/22/3294005

34 Addison Grove, London W4 1ER

- 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 Ms Tatiana Elsadek against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref P/2021/2909, dated 14 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of timber and Perspex panels fixed to the west side of the existing canopy, trellis panels around the canopy post and a timber shed at the rear ground floor flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of timber and clear plastic panels fixed to the west side of the existing canopy, trellis panels around the canopy post and a timber shed at the rear ground floor flat at 34 Addison Grove, London, W4 1ER in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2021/2909, dated 14 July 2021, and approved plans: 333-EX-01 (Existing Layout); 279-EX/PRO-01 (Existing/Proposed Layout); Cover letter dated 13 July 2021; and Location Plan dated 10 October 2017.

Preliminary Matters

2. In carrying out my site visit, I found the timber and clear plastic panels, trellis panels and shed had been erected. The proposal has therefore been implemented at the time of this decision.
3. The application form describes the panels as "Perspex". In my decision I have described the panels as 'clear plastic' to avoid attributing the panels to any specific brand or manufacturer.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and Bedford Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site includes a ground floor flat and adjoining garden, located on a corner plot adjacent to Addison Grove and Abinger Road. The appeal property is located within a brick-built, former detached house which has been subdivided into flats.
6. A rectangular, open-sided canopy constructed from white-painted metal supports and roof struts with clear roofing materials adjoins the rear of the

appeal property. The timber and clear plastic panels and trellis, which are the subject of this appeal, adjoin the canopy.

7. The appeal site is located within Bedford Park Conservation Area (CA). The CA comprises an area of attractive suburban housing. The Conservation Area appraisal describes the area's significance as being derived from its trees and green spaces and the artistically designed houses of moderate size, constructed during the mid to late Victorian period and beyond. Architectural features that define the area include rubbed-brick arches and dressings, terracotta embellishments, open-bed and broken pediments, monumental chimneys, shaped and Dutch gables, tile-hung gabled walls, white painted balustrades, balconies and bay-windows.
8. The timber and clear plastic panels have been fitted below the flank edge of the canopy, adjacent to a staircase providing access to a first floor flat. The timber faces the patio section of the ground floor flat, with the plastic panels facing outward toward the staircase. The panels do not extend the full width of the canopy; a section has been left open to enable access to the garden and staircase. The staircase partially encloses this side of the canopy, and therefore the additional enclosing effect of timber and clear plastic panels is minimal.
9. Wooden trellis panels have been erected around two canopy posts with additional trellis panels sited below the front edge of the canopy. An open section is retained at the middle to provide a route from the patio to the lawn. At the time of my site visit, the trellises served to provide support to climbing plants. The trellis panels provide structure within the garden's design, but do not enclose the canopy.
10. The Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (SPD) indicates that outbuildings should be as far away from the house as possible. The modest-sized timber shed has been sited close to the building's rear elevation and therefore does not meet this requirement. However, the shed has been positioned beside the staircase and behind a trellis fence, thereby reducing its visual prominence. The shed therefore does not have an overbearing effect on the dwelling house, nor does it detract from the appearance of the house.
11. The panels, trellis and shed are constructed from timber. The use of timber within the garden is not out-of-keeping with the appearance of the CA. Notably, the appeal site's boundary fence is of timber construction. The clear plastic panels are generally concealed from public view. The use of clear plastic is therefore not likely to affect the appearance of the CA. The materials used in the proposal do not therefore appear inappropriate within the context of the building or surrounding area.
12. The rear garden extends alongside Abinger Road and is enclosed by a tall, close boarded timber fence. The panels and shed are set back from the boundary and are generally concealed from view from the street by the timber fence and by trees and shrubs within the appeal site. A small section of timber panel is partially visible above the height of the fence and below the canopy when viewed from the street directly opposite the appeal site. The shed is not readily visible from the street. The proposal's visual effects upon the street scene are inconsequential since it is generally out of view from public spaces.

13. As set out above the proposal does not give rise to unreasonable enclosure, the materials used in the proposal are not inappropriate, and the proposal is generally concealed from public spaces and would not be visually prominent. For these reasons, the proposal does not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the Bedford Park Conservation Area. The proposal therefore accords with Hounslow Local Plan 2015 (HLP) policies CC1 and CC2 which require new development to retain the areas high-quality character and urban design.
14. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. In the absence of harm to the CA's character and appearance, I conclude that the proposal has a neutral effect upon the heritage asset's significance. The proposal therefore accords with HLP Policy CC4 and para. 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework which give great weight to the conservation of heritage assets.
15. As discussed above, whilst the siting of the shed does not accord with the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines, the proposal does not conflict with HLP Policy SC7 which seeks to ensure that alterations and additions do not harm to the character and appearance of the building or area.

Other Matters

16. A schedule of restrictive covenants relating to the appeal site was submitted by a third party during the appeal. Restrictive covenants are not a consideration material to the grant of planning permission, and therefore has had no bearing on my decision.
17. In addition, a previous appeal decision relating to the site have been brought to my attention¹. Whilst I have had regard to the previous case, it does not alter my conclusions on this appeal.

Conditions

18. The development has already been constructed and therefore no time limit condition is necessary. Reference to the approved plans is included as part of my decision, and therefore no specific condition is required listing those plans.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above, the development accords with the development plan taken as a whole and therefore I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

E Dade

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/F5540/C/18/3200984 and linked case APP/F5540/W/18/3200981