



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 May 2023

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/23/3317574

205 Popes Lane, Ealing W5 4NH

- 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 Julian King against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00885/205/P6, dated 12 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as the 'creation of a single-storey front extension, garage conversion with upgraded walls and floor to provide a habitable space, removal of the garage doors and replacement of a window, flat roof raised to match the neighbours'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single-storey front extension, garage conversion with upgraded walls and floor to provide a habitable space, the removal of the garage doors and replacement with a window, and a raised flat roof at 205 Popes Lane, Ealing W5 4NH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00885/205/P6, dated 12 December 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 hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL-R00-EX-101, PL-R00-EX-102, PL-R00-EX-103, PL-R00-EX-104, PL-R00-EX-105, PL-R00-PR-101, PL-R00-PR-102, PL-R00-PR-103, PL-R00-PR-104, PL-R00-PR-105 and PL-R00-PR-106.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of the proposal in my banner from the application form, but in my formal decision I have amended it slightly in the interests of clarity and to omit reference to matters which are not an act of development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area, including whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that, in respect of development affecting conservation areas, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing their character or appearance. The National Planning Policy Framework ('Framework') sets out that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, such as conservation areas.
5. Policy CC4 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (2015) ('HLP') seeks to conserve and enhance the significance of the borough's heritage assets, and is thus broadly consistent with the Framework's approach.
6. The host property forms one half of a semi-detached pair which backs on to Gunnersbury Park to the rear. It falls just within the Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area ('GPCA').
7. I understand that the Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area Character Appraisal focuses on the significance of the parkland, and the residential estate to the east which is an example of a relatively unspoilt garden suburb. In contrast, the houses on Popes Lane are described as a typical interwar speculative development of two storey houses. I observed that many of the semi-detached houses close to the appeal site have been substantially altered with porches, single and two storey side extensions, and side-facing dormer windows.
8. Whilst recessed garages with a false pitch may once have been typical of the area, many have been altered or replaced. As evidenced at part 5 (k) to (p) of the appellant's statement, that includes the host's semi-detached neighbour at No 203 which has a side projection with a false pitch but whose front face aligns with the front of the house, Nos 197 and 199 which have two storey, flat-roofed side extensions which are not set back, and Nos 193 and 195 which have flush, flat-roofed single storey side projections. Alterations are also proposed to the side of No 207.
9. This proposal would be flush with the host's principal front face. In that regard there would be a limited conflict with part 4.4 of the Hounslow Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2017 ('SPD') which advises that single storey side extensions should be set back at least one metre, but continues that exceptions may be made where the symmetry of a semi-detached pair would be restored.
10. However, the extension would be recessed behind the host's porch and distinctive bay window, it would be faced in matching materials and with similar fenestration, and it would be subordinate in mass, width and height to the original building. The false pitched roof would be replaced with a raised flat roof, but the scheme's layout would provide a degree of symmetry with the similarly positioned side projection at No 203.
11. Whilst some nearby side extensions and alterations may be quite historic, and some may pre-date the SPD, they nonetheless form part of the area's established character. In the context of the diverse form, siting and appearance of side extensions in this streetscene, the scheme would not appear incongruous.
12. Consequently, notwithstanding the slight conflict with part 4.4 of the SPD, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host or the area.

It would not therefore conflict with those parts of HLP Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 which expect proposals to complement the original building and to harmonise with the area, having regard to matters such as layout, grain, massing, height, materials and detailing.

13. As it would preserve the character and appearance of the GPCA and would conserve its significance, the scheme would not conflict with part 6.0 of the SPD, nor with HLP Policy CC4 or the Framework's stance on designated heritage assets.
14. Turning to the matter of conditions, I have considered those suggested by the Council against the Framework's tests. The standard time limit condition is necessary, as is, in the interests of certainty, a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. To further good design, I have also imposed a matching materials condition.
15. However, given the very modest scale of the proposed works, I am not persuaded that a condition limiting the hours of demolition and construction is necessary to protect adjoining amenities.
16. Summing up, the scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the area, and the significance of the GPCA would be conserved. Consequently, having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR