



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2023

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08.02.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/23/3322296

12 Clarence Road, Chiswick, Hounslow, London W4 3AS

- 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 Holden Property Group against the decision of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref P/2023/0494 and 00268/12/P3, dated 15 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 11 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is removal of a front wall and pillars to provide a bin store in the front garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. For the sake of clarity and brevity I have taken the description of development from the Council's decision notice.
3. At my site visit I saw that the front wall had been removed and the development had been constructed. I have dealt with the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Wellesley Road Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site lies within the Wellesley Road Conservation Area (WRCA). In accordance with the duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 I am required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. Moreover, paragraph 205 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (the Framework) states that when considering the impact of development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
6. The character of the WRCA, particularly in the immediate locality of the appeal site, is predominantly residential terraced properties of traditional architectural design. The built form is modest in scale with front areas of properties being mainly a mix of low boundary treatment and shrubbery. The significance of the WRCA, particularly within close proximity to the appeal site, is the sensitive and modest front garden areas within the traditional appearance of the built form.

7. The bin store does not project beyond the site boundary however, it is a large and obtrusive structure that detracts from the significant characteristics of the WRCA and the architectural detailing of the surrounding buildings.
8. Whilst there is a mix in the built form, particularly in the wider area, with various extensions, structures and high boundary treatment in the front areas of properties, as well as parked vehicles, the area immediate to the appeal site is much more sensitive in terms of the scale of the built form. The bin store is a visually intrusive structure given its scale and position within the street scene.
9. The proposal does not result in the loss of mature trees and does provide screening for bins and bicycles. The pillars either side of the bin store are sympathetic in design. Nevertheless, the size of the bin store is not proportionate and is an inappropriate form of development that has a harmful effect on the surrounding area and significance of the WRCA.
10. Accordingly, the bin store does not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the WRCA. The development does not accord with Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan, the London Borough of Hounslow Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document and the Framework which seeks development to conserve features or qualities that contribute to an area's character, promote high quality urban design, and conserve and enhance heritage assets.
11. The development does not have an adverse effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with regards to privacy, light, outlook and overshadowing. These matters, however, do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.

Conclusion

12. The development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding.
13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR