



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/22/3310624

12 The Lindens, Hartington Road, London W4 3UQ

- 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 Sunil Shivanand (Stalwart Global Limited) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00699/12/P2, dated 19 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 29 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side extension
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on the host building and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Grove Park Conservation Area (GPCA).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey end-of-terrace house. It forms part of a 1970s residential estate comprising terraces laid out in a formal arrangement facing areas of green space. The terraces feature tile hanging to the upper floors and are book-ended by brick flank elevations. Whilst some of the properties have been altered, including the addition of porches, the estate displays a high degree of visual unity by virtue of its layout and design, and forms a pleasant residential environment that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the GPCA.
4. Due to its siting at the end of the terrace and the fact the nearest terrace is set behind it, the appeal property's flank elevation is very exposed and therefore a relatively prominent feature in the street scene.
5. The proposal would comprise the erection of a 2-storey side addition that would extend to the side boundary of the appeal property and would be set behind the main front elevation of the terrace. It would feature a pitched roof and be constructed of brick. This would be wider, deeper and substantially taller than the relatively inconsequential single-storey addition it would replace.
6. Whilst the proposal would be subservient in height and scale to the appeal property, it would disrupt the unity of the terrace and the formal layout of the

area and would be an incongruous feature in the street scene due to its very exposed location. I therefore conclude that, due to its siting and size, the appeal proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the appearance of the estate and terrace of which the appeal property forms part and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the GPCA.

7. For these reasons the proposal fails to accord with Policy SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015) (LP) which expects development to complement the original building and harmonise with the wider area. There is also conflict with LP Policies CC1, CC2 and CC4 which seek to ensure that development complements the character of the area and conserves and enhances the significance of the Borough's heritage assets.
8. I note that planning permission was granted in 2015¹ for a single-storey side extension of similar footprint to the appeal proposal. As this permission related to a smaller form of development and is no longer capable of being carried out, I attach limited weight to it. Similarly, I note the planning approvals for additions to 19 and 25 The Lindens² granted in 2000 and 2018 respectively. The former pre-dates current planning policy and is less exposed in views from the public realm than the appeal proposal. The latter has a smaller footprint than the appeal proposal and is not visible from the public realm. The recent planning permission for the redevelopment of the nearby garages³ is not comparable to the appeal proposal.
9. Whilst the proposal 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 not result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties, would make efficient use of land in a sustainable location and provide improved living accommodation for occupiers of the appeal property. These matters do not amount to public benefits 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

¹ reference 00699/12/P1

² references 00699/19/P3 and 00699/25/P1

³ Reference 00699/C/P1