



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 4 September 2024

by H Smith BSc (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 October 2024

Appeal A Ref: APP/F5540/W/24/3343712

48 Woodstock Road, Ealing, Chiswick W4 1UF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Hubert and Brigitte Sommelet against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is 01234/48/P10.
 - The development proposed is described "as-built construction of the pitched glazed roof to the new side extension that encapsulates and protects the original side window."
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/F5540/Y/24/3343717

48 Woodstock Road, Ealing, Chiswick W4 1UF

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Hubert and Brigitte Sommelet against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is 01234/48/L9.
 - The works proposed are described "as-built construction of the pitched glazed roof to the new side extension that encapsulates and protects the original side window."
-

Decisions

1. **Appeal A** is dismissed.
2. **Appeal B** is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. As the proposal relates to a listed building which is within a conservation area, I have had special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act).
4. The two appeals concern the same scheme under different, complementary legislation. I have dealt with both appeals together in my reasoning.
5. The appellant seeks to regularise the development and works carried out for a section of pitched structural glazing that has been installed to the side extension at 48 Woodstock Road. The pitched structural glazing is different from the approved scheme refs: 01234/48/P7 and 01234/48/L6. Alterations were required to the approved scheme which were granted permission (refs: 01234/48/P9 and 01234/48/L8), but these approved alterations did not include the current appeals proposal.
6. At my site visit I saw that the pitched structural glazing had been installed to the roof at the rear of the side extension. However, as I cannot be certain that

what has been built is fully in accordance with the plans before me, I have assessed the development and works as shown on the submitted plans.

Main Issue

7. The main issue is whether the proposal would i) preserve the Grade II listed building, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses; and ii) preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Bedford Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

Special interest and significance

8. The appeal property, 48 Woodstock Road (No 48), is a 3-storey semi-detached dwelling with front and rear gardens. It forms part of a Grade II listed¹ building known as '46 and 48 Woodstock Road'. 46 Woodstock Road has been subdivided into flats.
9. The listed building is mainly constructed from traditional red brick and clay tiles with modillion eaves cornice, single-storey bays and flat door hoods to its front elevation. This and the presence of similar palettes of materials and window styles, is part of the heritage merit of the listed building.
10. The listed building is located within the Bedford Park Conservation Area (CA). Bedford Park is within two London Boroughs, Ealing and Hounslow, and is an area of particular architectural interest as it is known as the First Garden Suburb. The houses were built for the artistic middle classes in a style known as Queen Anne revival.
11. From the evidence available to me, I consider that the special interest and significance of the listed building to be largely derived from its historic and architectural interests. Important contributors in these regards which are pertinent to the appeals are the building's surviving historic fabric and design, and its historic context, forming part of a garden suburb of similarly designed dwellings characterised by Queen Anne revival style. The planned layout and interrelationship of the component parts of this estate inform and underpin the character and appearance and thus special interest and significance of the Conservation Area, to which the listed building makes a positive contribution.

Proposal and effects

12. The proposal incorporates the use of a single large structural glazed panel with a highly polished reflective surface, installed at a steep angle. The glazing is edged with a thick black border and is flanked by Sarnafil material on either side of the glazing panel. The reflective, smooth surface of the glazing combined with the Sarnafil edges would appear overly modern and sleek in comparison to the textured, aged look of the listed building's historic materials. These contemporary elements would disrupt the visual balance between the historic structure and the extension, causing the new addition to appear jarring and out of character with the rest of the listed building.
13. The appellant states that as structural glazing is a contemporary material, Sarnafil, also a contemporary material, was selected for the sections either side of the glazing. Nevertheless, Sarnafil, being a modern synthetic material

¹ List Entry Number: 1240515 – 46 and 48 Woodstock Road, Grade II

with a grey matt finish, would contrast sharply with the traditional materials of the listed building.

14. While the proposal would be positioned on the rear section of the side extension, during my site visit I observed that the glazed structure would be highly visible from Woodstock Road. This is mainly due to the excessive steepness of the pitched glazing and its smooth reflective finish, which would make the side extension stand out awkwardly, appearing incongruous within the context of the street's established aesthetic.
15. Consequently, the introduction of modern materials like Sarnafil and the steeply glazed pitch roof would create a noticeable dissonance between the side extension and the listed building, undermining the building's integrity and disrupting the visual harmony of the surrounding area.
16. The appellant indicates that the proposal has reduced the area of glazing that was previously approved in applications ref: 01234/48/P7 and 01234/48/L6, with flat roofed sections either side of the structural glazing. However, the submitted plan (A691/AP01) illustrates the shallow pitched roof over the pantry for the originally approved scheme, and the steeper pitch structural glazing which is the subject of these appeals. Therefore, although I acknowledge that a large area of structural glazing was previously approved for the side extension, this was at a much shallower angle than the proposal before me. Thus, the side extension is fundamentally different from the approved scheme as the proposed section is taller with a steeply angled glazed roof.
17. I accept that the proposal would encapsulate the whole of the side window, which would allow the historic window to remain unaltered. Nevertheless, for the reasons given, the proposal would compromise the significance of the listed building.
18. Taking into account the building's positioning within the CA, it follows that the identified negative effects to the listed building would also harm the positive qualities of the CA as a whole.
19. My attention has been drawn to a listed building in Bedford Park that has recently been approved for contemporary extensions using Sarnafil (ref: A691/P50). However, I have not been presented with the full details of this development. In this example, the horizontal positioning of the Sarnafil material combined with the large vertical glazing panels and brick finish creates a contemporary extension to the host building that provides a clear distinction between the old and new elements of the property. In contrast, the proposal would appear as an inappropriate addition rather than a sensitive continuation of the original architecture.
20. My attention has also been drawn to other side extensions, including 37 and 58 Woodstock Road. However, it does not appear that these extensions have the solid grey Sarnafil flanks that have been constructed on No 48, nor is the glazing lined with a thick black border. Indeed, the photographs (A691/P42) show that these other extensions are more sensitively built with white edging and glazing bars, reminiscent of the patent glazing used within the local area historically, and glazed side panels rather than the solid Sarnafil side panels constructed at No 48. The appeals extension would appear incongruous for the reasons explained.

21. Previous appeal decisions² have also been referenced. Nevertheless, I do not have the plans for these other appeals before me and thus I do not know the design or scale of the approved structure. I have also been referred to glazing at 21 and 41 Priory Avenue. These extensions include glazing bars and conservation grade roof lights, which is different to the current appeals proposal. The specific details and circumstances which led to these other developments being accepted are not before me. I am therefore unable to draw any meaningful comparisons with the appeals proposal.
22. The appellant indicates that the glass on previous permissions for glazed side extensions show reflections, depending on time of day and weather conditions. While this may be the case, the glazing on the appeal property is not only reflective but also has an excessively steep pitch due to the height of the side wall being low. This therefore makes the glazing highly visible, drawing attention away from the historical aspects of the building and its surroundings.
23. The appellant has highlighted other glazed extensions in the area, but I have not been presented with sufficient details to make a suitable comparison. In any event, these do not set a valid precedent for listed buildings, to which the weighty statutory duties of sections 16(2) and 66(1) and the provisions of relevant national and local policies apply. There would also be different contextual relationships with the surroundings of these other buildings, some of which may not have the same historical importance as the proposal before me. Each listed building is unique, and I have determined these appeals based on the evidence before me and my own observations.
24. Drawing the above together, I find that the proposal would not i) preserve the Grade II listed building, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, and ii) preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. In doing so, it would harm the significance of these designated heritage assets.

Public benefits and balance

25. With reference to paragraphs 207 and 208 of the Framework, in finding harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the magnitude of that harm should be assessed. Given the extent and fairly localised nature of the proposal, I find that the harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets assessed above would be individually and cumulatively 'less than substantial' but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight. Paragraph 208 of the Framework requires this harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including where appropriate, securing the asset's optimum viable use.
26. In this case, economic benefits would be delivered through the manufacturing and construction phase and the general investment into the property. I also acknowledge that the proposal would encapsulate and therefore protect a historic window. Nevertheless, I am not persuaded that similar benefits could not be achieved by a proposal which would be less harmful to the significance of these designated heritage assets.
27. Additionally, no compelling evidence is before me which confirms that the property would not be usable or viable as a dwelling or that its future would be

² APP/F5540/W/21/3277566 and APP/F5540/Y/21/3277564

at risk if the appeals were to fail and the development and works as proposed were not implemented. In these respects, the identified harm to the significance of the listed building and the CA has not been clearly and convincingly justified.

28. On balance, in giving considerable importance and weight to the harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets, I find that this would not be outweighed by the limited public benefits arising from the proposal.
29. I conclude that the proposal would not i) preserve the Grade II listed building, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses; and ii) preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Bedford Park Conservation Area. It would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and the provisions within the Framework which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment.
30. It would also conflict with Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (adopted 2015). Amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure developments complement the character of the area through high quality design and conserve and enhance the significance of the Borough's heritage assets. The proposal would also conflict with guidance set out in the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 2017), which amongst other things, seeks to ensure extensions and alterations complement the original building and maintain the character of the general street scene.

Other Matters

31. The proposal would not result in a loss of light to the neighbouring property and there would be no overlooking. Nonetheless, this is a neutral consideration and does not weigh in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

32. **Appeal A:** The proposed development would conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole. There are no material considerations which indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that Appeal A should be dismissed.
33. **Appeal B:** For the reasons given, I conclude that Appeal B should be dismissed.

H Smith

INSPECTOR