



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 May 2024

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/24/3342048

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/P7, dated 27 November 2023, was refused by notice dated 22 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as "*Minor roof detail change (retrospective) from approved proposals, where hip roof meets new flat roof of extension*"
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The development described in the banner heading above has been carried out. This appeal therefore relates to an application for retrospective planning permission.
3. My assessment is based on the built scheme as opposed to the application drawings which do not accurately depict the works that have been carried out.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the appeal scheme on the character and appearance of the host building and whether it preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a 2-storey mid-terraced house. It is located in a residential street comprising terraces of handsome houses of similar age and appearance. This creates a pleasant and relatively uniform residential environment that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the CA. To the rear the houses have single-storey rear wings with hipped roofs. These original elements are a key feature of the terrace. However, many of the houses have been extended and altered at the rear which has somewhat denuded the original arrangement.
6. Planning permission was granted in 2021 for the erection of a single-storey rear infill extension. This scheme extended rearwards so as to line through

with the rear wall of the existing rear wing and featured a flat roof similar in level to the eaves of the rear wing.

7. The appeal scheme matches the approval in respect of its footprint but the flat roof is noticeably higher than the eaves of the original rear wing and the fenestration features noticeably slimmer frames than was approved in 2021. As a consequence of the additional height the appeal scheme has an uncomfortable and jarring relationship to the roof of the original wing and this, combined with fenestration arrangement, results in an overly dominant and incongruous addition that is out of keeping with the appearance of the terrace.
8. Due to its height, design and appearance, I therefore conclude that the appeal scheme has an unacceptable effect on the appearance of the terrace and fails to preserve the character and appearance of the CA. As such the scheme is contrary to Policies SC7, CC1, CC2 and CC4 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015) which seek to ensure that development complements the original building and the character of the area, and conserves and enhances the significance of the Borough's heritage assets. There is also conflict with the aims of the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines (2017) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), the former of which states that in conservation areas development must be of a high standard of design and should respect the existing architectural style, scale and proportion, in and around the site.
9. Whilst the appeal scheme fails to preserve the character and appearance of the CA, the harm is 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 appeal scheme. As the appeal scheme relates to an addition to a private residence there are no public benefits associated with it.
10. As each planning application and appeal needs to be considered on its individual merits and against current development plan policies and guidance, I attach limited weight to the earlier rear additions in the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR