



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2024

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/24/3346374
10 Crofton Avenue, Chiswick, W4 3EW

- 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 Aleksandra Major against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Reference is 01615/10/P3.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension following the demolition of the existing conservatory. Conversion of the existing garage into a habitable space with a front extension and replacement of garage door with window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a three-storey semi-detached home set a little back and off to the side of the end of a cul de sac. The locality is one of established residential character and the arrangement of 1990's Palladian style villas results in an area of very pleasing appearance. The proposal is as described above.
 4. The site lies within the Chiswick House Conservation Area (CA). There is a duty imposed by Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requiring decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. The Council's Local Plan (LP) Policy CC4 and the London Plan's (LoP) Policy (HC1) reflect this. LP Policies CC1 and CC2 and LoP Policy D4 are also all relevant to the case. Taken together and amongst other matters they seek to secure development which would display good quality design, complement the original building and its context and reflect local distinctiveness.
-

5. The Council's concerns rest with the proposed front extension and replacement of garage door with a window. It concludes that through design, position and appearance there would be aesthetic harm the appeal property, the pair of semi-detached houses and the wider scene. The Council considers that the plans would not reflect the locality and would be harmful to the CA. The Appellant puts the case that there would be no immediate or wider harm, respectful design is proposed, the development would be subordinate, and looking more widely would have very limited visibility in this grouping at the end of the cul de sac.
6. For my part I find the frontage symmetry of dwellings, and of pairs in particular, to be so important to the qualities and characteristics of this area of the neighbourhood that I would be unable to condone change as proposed. The appeal scheme, notwithstanding some subtlety, would unbalance the pair and this would be seen more widely. The proposal would be jarring on the eye and would very obviously be an unfortunate post original development alteration not for the greater visual good.
7. Given the foregoing I conclude that the change proposed would be contrary to the aims of Section 72(1) and would conflict with the development plan policies which I cite in paragraph 4 above.

Other matters

8. I do understand the Appellant's wish for improved accommodation. I would agree that the scheme would not directly detract from residential amenity for neighbours. I can see that thought has been given to the use of matching materials and window style.
9. An appeal decision (APP/F5540/D/17/3180814) at no. 15 was drawn to my attention. This removed a garage door but the difference there was it is a mid-terrace home and the Inspector found that the planned change would introduce *more* symmetry. The two other examples drawn to my attention are also not comparable in that garage doors remained albeit they were changed in form. In any event I must determine this case on its own merits and my reasoning is set out above.
10. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
11. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) have been considered. Key objectives of the Framework are to protect and enhance the qualities of the built environment as well as to safeguard heritage assets; development plan policies which I cite mirror these. The Framework underlines that great weight should be given to a heritage asset's conservation. The appeal proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset however what public benefits there would be would not outweigh this harm. Furthermore, there are no other benefits, including to the Appellant, which to my mind would be of a scale to outweigh the harm to the Conservation Area which I have identified.

Overall conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR