



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 November 2023

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/23/3327796

18 Park Drive, Acton, Hounslow, London W3 8NA

- 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 Nicholas Hearne against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00854/18/P5 dated 21 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as retrospective application for the removal of pebble dash on the first-floor rear elevation and replace with painted render to match rear ground-floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for retrospective application for the removal of pebble dash on the first-floor rear elevation and replace with painted render to match rear ground-floor extension at 18 Park Drive, Acton, Hounslow, London W3 8NA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00854/18/P5 dated 21 April 2023, and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the submission of the appeal the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) has been superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) (the Framework). Both parties were given the opportunity to provide additional comments, therefore no party has been prejudiced or caused any injustice by me proceeding with the appeal in light of the changes in policy.
3. At the time of my site visit, the development was in place. The application form made clear that the scheme had been submitted retrospectively and I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Application for costs

4. An application for costs was made by Mr Nicholas Hearne against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the replacement of the original pebble dash with rendering material on the character and appearance of the Gunnersbury Park conservation area.

Reasons

6. The site is within a predominantly residential area within the Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area. In accordance with the statutory duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; I am required to have special regard to the effect of the proposed development on the character or appearance of the area.
7. Paragraph 205 of the Framework states that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset when considering the impact of a proposal on such an asset. This is irrespective of the level of harm.
8. The area is characterised by predominantly traditional terraced two-storey properties, forming a harmonious built form. Properties share common features providing a regular pattern of development.
9. From the Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area Appraisal (2018) (the Conservation Appraisal) I note that the conservation area comprises historic parks and gardens, a cemetery and surrounding well laid-out early interwar housing estates. The Conservation Appraisal sets out the different character areas, the appeal site lies with the Gunnersbury Park Estate character area which consists primarily of the interwar housing of the Gunnersbury Park Estate and its associated recreation and retail facilities.
10. The estate is subject to an Article 4 Direction which removes permitted development rights in order to protect what remains of the original features. In this case there is no permitted development right to remove the original pebble dash or paint the façades of the appeal property.
11. I observed during my site visit that the majority of properties within the immediate vicinity of the appeal property appear to have original pebble dash to the rear elevation, however some of these appeared to be painted white. The appellant has drawn my attention to No. 60, 62 and 64 Park Drive which are properties with different finishing materials, notably pebble dash, painted render and painted pebble dash.
12. Park Place Drive bounds the rear of the site, most properties facing this highway have garages to the rear of their gardens. Garages along this road vary in terms of material, whilst pebble dash is prevalent, brickwork, painted pebble dash and render are also noticeable.
13. The development replaces the original pebble dash with rendering. It is obvious that rendering offers a sharper, and in general smoother finish than the pebble dash. From Park Place Drive the use of the white render which has a slightly rough texture rather than a smooth render does not look out of keeping with those properties which are painted white.
14. The extension previously approved provides a modern addition to the rear of the property and extension to the garage which are not incongruous to the

area. Whilst the loss of an original feature is disappointing, in this instance the replacement material does not appear incompatible with the area.

15. The replacement of the original pebble dash with painted render does not harm the character and appearance of the Gunnersbury Park conservation area. I find that the development would preserve the conservation area.
16. There is no conflict with Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan, Volume One 2015-2030, which seek amongst other things for developments to harmonise with the adjacent properties, preserving the character of the streetscene and conserving heritage assets.
17. There is no conflict with the Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines (2017) which seeks amongst other things to ensure the range of materials for extensions are kept to a minimum and ensure developments would not harm the character of a conservation area or the building itself.
18. There is also no conflict with the Framework which seeks to ensure developments are of good design appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings and that the historic environment is protected.

Other Matters

19. There is disagreement between parties with regard to whether the removal of the pebble dash and replacement with render has already been approved under the previous approvals. Given my findings on the proposed development there is no need for me to address this issue.

Conclusion

20. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.
21. Conditions relating to standard time limit for commencement of development, plans to be adhered to and materials to be used are not relevant or necessary as the development is complete.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR