



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 February 2023

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/22/3309533

49 Princes Avenue, London W3 8LX

- 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 J Devaney against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00897/49/P1, dated 23 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension and the demolition of the rear workshop to extend the existing detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the description of development provided on the decision notice in the banner heading above as this more accurately reflects the scope of development proposed.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effects of the proposals on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area and whether they would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area (GPCA).

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2-storey end-of-terrace house with a single-storey kitchen wing to the rear. It is located in a residential street comprising terraces of handsome houses of similar age and appearance. This creates a pleasant and relatively uniform residential environment that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the GPCA. Whilst many of the properties have been altered and extended, on the whole, the terrace of which the appeal property forms part retains the original arrangement at the rear. This is a matter to which I attach significant weight.
5. The appeal proposals include the erection of a flat-roofed, single-storey, infill addition next to the kitchen wing. This would line through with the rear elevation of the kitchen wing and a wide glazed opening would be formed spanning the old and new portions of the rear elevation. The loss of the

- window in the rear elevation of the kitchen wing and the formation of a wide opening would result in an incongruous form of development that would be at odds with the appearance of the terrace. Due to its size and design this proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the appearance of the terrace and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the GPCA.
6. At the back of the appeal property there is a workshop and a garage. The latter is accessed from Triangle Way, the lane to the rear, and forms part of a group of semi-detached garages with pitched roofs. Where these remain intact they contribute positively to the appearance of Triangle Way and the neighbouring tennis courts. Where garages have been widened and wide doors or shutters installed this has had a negative impact on the appearance of this area.
 7. The proposal would include the demolition of the workshop to enable the construction of a larger garage with a roller shutter that would extend across almost the whole width of the rear boundary of the appeal property. This would lead to further disintegration of the pattern of development and appearance of Triangle Way. Due to its size and design this proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the appearance of the area and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the GPCA.
 8. For these reasons the proposals fail to accord with Policies SC7, CC1, CC2 and CC4 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015) which seek to ensure that development complements the original building, the character of the area and conserves and enhances the significance of the Borough's heritage assets. There is also conflict with the aims of the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines (2017) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), the former of which states that in conservation areas development must be of a high standard of design and respect the existing architectural style, scale, proportion, position, materials, roof, boundary treatment and landscaping in and around the site.
 9. Whilst the proposals would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the GPCA, the harm to this heritage asset would be less than substantial. In these circumstances Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) requires me to weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposal. I note that the proposal would provide additional space for the occupiers of the appeal property, however this is a private benefit. There are no identified public benefits associated with the appeal proposal that would outweigh the unacceptable harm identified above.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR