



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 3 May 2023

by Mr JP Sargent BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th May 2023

APP/F5540/Y/22/3308752

25 Priory Avenue, London, W4 1TZ

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Anthony & Mrs Amy Vickers-Collins against the decision of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00899/25/L8, dated 26 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2022.
 - The works proposed are the installation of a spiral wine cellar within the single storey rear outrigger.
-

APP/F5540/W/22/3308756

25 Priory Avenue, London, W4 1TZ

- 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 Anthony & Mrs Amy Vickers-Collins against the decision of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00899/25/P4, dated 26 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a spiral wine cellar within the single storey rear outrigger.
-

Decisions

APP/F5540/Y/22/3308752

1. The appeal is allowed, and listed building consent is granted for the installation of a spiral wine cellar within the single storey rear outrigger at 25 Priory Avenue, London, W4 1TZ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 00899/25/L8 dated 26 May 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.
 - 2) The works shall be in accordance with the following approved plans: PL01, PL02, & PL03.

APP/F5540/W/22/3308756

2. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the installation of a spiral wine cellar within the single storey rear outrigger at 25 Priory Avenue, London, W4 1TZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00899/25/P4, dated 26 May 2022, 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 shall be in accordance with the following approved plans: PL01, PL02, & PL03.

Main Issue

3. The main issue with both of these appeals is whether the works would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of this Grade II listed building, whether they would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the Bedford Park Conservation Area, and whether they would cause any harm to the significance of either of these designated heritage assets.

Reasons

4. The significance of the Bedford Park Conservation Area lies partly in it still being apparent as an extensive area of high-quality suburban housing from the late Victorian period, which was designed around the Aesthetic Movement. The character and appearance of the area is dominated by housing of that style, sitting in mature landscaping.
5. The appeal property and its adjoining neighbour, 23 Priory Avenue, together comprise a Grade II listed building. Their significance is due to a great extent in the way their origins as part of this housing area are still apparent, with matters such as their scale, plan form and detailing contributing to their special architectural and historic interest. As a result, not only do these dwellings have a heritage value in their own right, but they also make a positive contribution to the significance of the conservation area.
6. These houses were originally designed with a single storey kitchen element projecting beyond the rear elevation, on which was a smaller scullery. At No 25 these were amalgamated to form a larger kitchen area.
7. The proposal would be, in effect, a cylinder sunk into the centre of the kitchen, that would be going down nearly 3m. When access was not required, the works would be concealed beneath a trapdoor on the floor.
8. With the exception of some minor fresh air vents, no part of the works would be visible from outside the building, as they would otherwise be entirely subterranean and beneath the rear kitchen projection. They would therefore cause no harm to the building's appearance.
9. The scheme would be changing the plan form of the house, but that though could be said of any extension and so, of itself, is not necessarily a reason to resist it. In my opinion, even though the proposal would be introducing what the appellants term a cellar into a dwelling where one is not now found, given its limited size and concealed nature, its effect on the building's plan form and historic footprint would not be harmful.
10. Turning to the works' effect on the kitchen, as stated this has already changed from when originally designed. Moreover, it has also been modernised with contemporary units and what appears to be a recently laid floor. As a result, and mindful that, apart from when access is needed, the proposed cellar would be beneath the trapdoor, I consider it would not harm any historic character that room currently possesses.
11. If, under the recently laid kitchen floor, there is material that is contemporaneous with when the house was built, then the scheme would lead

to a loss of some historic fabric. However, that of itself does not mean it is unacceptable in principle. Rather, given the status of the kitchen and scullery area and the alterations that have occurred over time, I have no reason to consider that the loss of any historic fabric that might be present would harm the building's significance.

12. Finally, as the works would not be readily apparent from outside the building, and as I have identified no way in which they would harm the significance of No 25, I consider they would not fail to preserve the character or appearance of the conservation area.
13. Concerning conditions, the only ones I find to be necessary are those specifying the plans (for the avoidance of doubt) and requiring the works to start within 3 years.
14. In assessing this issue, I have noted the appeal decisions referenced by the Council. However, they related to schemes for basements that were much more extensive, and so would have had a greater effect on the footprints and plan forms of the buildings, than the works before me. Furthermore, light wells and grilles meant the works would have been noticeable externally and incongruous. I consider these to be material differences to the current scheme. The appeal decision concerning 44 Priory Avenue expressed the view that the absence of basements was a factor that contributed to the special interest of the listed buildings in Bedford Park. It accepted though that opinions differed as to whether this meant their provision should be precluded in the future. Whilst I note those findings, to my mind, the limited scale of what is before me means it would not cause the harm to which that decision alluded. I also have no reason to find the scheme would cause structural or drainage problems.
15. Accordingly, I conclude the proposal would not harm the special architectural or historic interest of this listed building, would not fail to preserve the character or appearance of the Bedford Park Conservation Area, and would not harm the significance of either of these designated heritage assets. I therefore also conclude it would not conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and CC4 in the *London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan*, which seek development to respond to its context and conserve designated heritage assets, or guidance in the *National Planning Policy Framework*.

Conclusion

16. I therefore conclude that both appeals should be allowed.

JP Sargent

INSPECTOR