



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2025

by **C Skelly BA (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/25/3366535

63 Strand on the Green and 4 the Moorings, Chiswick, Hounslow, London W4 3PF

- 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 Adams and Mr & Mrs Caddy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2025/0063.
 - The development proposed is adjoining side roof extensions to both houses with 3 upward facing rooflights, a side roof extension with 1 upward facing rooflight to no. 4, a replacement side facing rooflight in existing roof slope to no. 4, a single storey rear infill extension to no. 63.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the roof extensions and associated works.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey rear infill extension to 63 Strand on the Green and 4 the Moorings, Chiswick, Hounslow, London W4 3PF in accordance with the terms of application, Ref P/2025/0063 and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: 1096-001, 1096-002-A, 1096-010-A, 1096-P011-A, 1096-012-B, 1096-013-A, 1096-020-A, 1096-P021-A, 1096-P022-A, 1096-P102-C, 1096-P110-B, 1096-P111-B, 1096-P112-E, 1096-P113-D, 1096-P120-C, 1096-P121-D, 1096-P122-B.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building, unless otherwise shown on the approved plans.

Preliminary Matters

3. Reference to the single storey rear infill extension to 4 the Moorings has been removed from the description in the banner heading above as the Council has confirmed that it already has permission.
4. Because the appeal site lies in the Strand on the Green Conservation Area (CA), I have had special regard to Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBCAA).

5. The proposed development includes a single storey rear extension to 63 Strand on the Green which would infill the area between the existing two storey outrigger. This element of the proposal is clearly severable both physically and functionally from the roof extensions and associated works element. Therefore, under section 79(1)(b) of the Act, I have the power to issue a split decision on this case.
6. The Council has not found any harm in relation to this element. The single storey extension therefore complies with Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (2015) (LP), which amongst other things seek to ensure that all new development conserves and takes opportunities to enhance their special qualities, conserve and enhance any heritage assets and be subordinate to the existing building. There have been no objections in relation to this proposed element, and I have no reason to disagree with this conclusion. I therefore consider that the single storey rear extension to 63 Strand on the Green should be allowed subject to the standard time limit condition and conditions requiring development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in the interests of certainty and a materials condition in the interests of character and appearance.

Main Issue

7. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Strand on the Green CA within which the site lies.

Reasons

8. The appeal site comprises a pair of dwellings located within a terrace which face onto the footpath which runs alongside the River Thames. Nos 63 Strand on the Green and 1 the Moorings, have Dutch Gables with the three properties in between having triangle shaped gables with tall chimney stacks, which give the terrace and its roofline a distinctive, uniform appearance. As the terrace fronts onto the river, it is prominent when viewed from public views on the opposite side of the river. The dwellings have two storey outbuildings along the rear of their gardens with access from Thames Road. As a result, public views towards the rear of the properties is restricted.
9. The appeal site is located within the Strand on the Green CA, which runs along the north side of the Thames towards the railway line away from Kew Bridge. Based on the submitted evidence, the age and design of properties, the significance of the CA is architectural and historical.
10. According to the Strand on the Green Conservation Area Appraisal (2018) (CAP) the CA is renowned as a particularly picturesque part of London. It goes on to state that the area's special architectural and historic interest lies with its intrinsically tranquil setting beside the water's edge, with fishermen's cottages, boat builders' sheds, public houses, maltings and larger and more elegant private houses added in the late eighteenth century. The CAP recognises several views which are considered vital to the character, appearance and appreciation of the significance of the CA. These include views from Oliver's Island, Kew Bridge and the Kew tow path. The CAP notes that inappropriate scale and character of roof extensions and loss of chimney stacks can lead to the erosion of characterful roofscapes. It also notes that the loss of group character is a threat to the CA.

11. The appeal site forms part of a terrace of 5 dwellings which the CAP describes as a charming informal group of five houses which are set back and have been carefully designed using second hand brick and shaped gables. I consider that the traditional appearance of the properties and unique rooflines form part of a key view from across the river and make a positive contribution to the significance of the CA.
12. Due to the limited width of the footpath to the front of the terrace it is not possible to see the roofs of the appeal properties from north of the river. However, I observed that the Dutch gable features and valley roofs of the appeal properties are clearly visible when viewed from Kew Bridge. The Kew tow path runs along the edge of the river along the opposite side of the appeal site. In places, views across the river are screened by landscaping, however there is a clearing with benches directly opposite the appeal site. From this vantage point the v shaped roof, and tall chimneys are clearly visible, despite being set against the backdrop of the roofs of properties along Thames Road, rather than the skyline. I noted that when viewed from this side of the river, that the existing roof extension at 3 the Moorings and 63 Strand on the Green are not particularly prominent given their modest scale and set back.
13. The proposal would involve the extension of the roof between 4 The Moorings and 63 Strand on the Green and side roof extension for 4 the Moorings, which would be set back approximately 1.65m from the front gable of 4 the Moorings and 2.8m from 63 Strand on the Green. Despite being set back, the extension would infill the entire gap between the valley roofs of the two appeal properties, detracting from its traditional appearance. Although the chimney between the properties would be retained, most of the structure would no longer be visible. Whilst I recognise that the current appeal is a modest triangular infill to what has been previously permitted it would completely remove the v shaped roof pattern, thereby eroding the unique character and appearance of the wider terrace. Whilst views from the north side of the river would be indiscernible, the proposal would be visible when viewed from the key views of the CA from Kew Bridge, the river and the Kew tow path and would thereby cause harm to the character and appearance of the CA.
14. The appellant has referred me to roof extensions which were previously granted permission at the appeal properties and 3 the Moorings for side roof extensions. I have also been referred to similar proposals which have been approved but not built out. Although these examples are visible from the other side of the river as they are set back and retain the valley shape of the roofline, the traditional appearance of the buildings is maintained. As the proposal would infill the gap in its entirety it is not directly comparable to these proposals.
15. The appellant has also referred me to permissions granted at the Ship House and 2 Ship Alley, the Dutch House, Nos 68, 75 and 83 Strand on the Green. However, these examples comprise individual properties or pairs and not a group as in the case of the appeal, therefore they are not directly comparable to the appeal case. In any event, I have determined the appeal on its own merits, based on the evidence before me.

Heritage Balance

16. The proposed roof extensions would harm the character and appearance of the host buildings which contribute positively to the CA, I find the harm to be less than substantial in this instance but nevertheless of considerable importance and

weight. Paragraph 215 of the Framework states that where harm is identified to the significance of designated heritage assets and their setting, it should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

17. The proposed roof extensions would provide additional living accommodation for the appellants, however the benefits would largely be private. Therefore, there are neutral public benefits which is insufficient to outweigh the less than substantial harm to the CA. Given this and the above, I conclude that the proposal would fail to satisfy the requirements of the LBCAA, Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the LP which amongst other things seek to ensure that all new development conserves and takes opportunities to enhance their special qualities, conserve and enhance any heritage assets and its setting and maintain the general character of the street scene.

Other Matters

18. No 63 adjoins Magnolia House¹ a Grade II Listed Building, which is well preserved with original windows and doors and adjoins Zoffany House another Grade II Listed Building². The other end of the terrace adjoins Compass House, a Grade II Listed Building³ which is a gable-fronted Dutch House. Mindful of the statutory duty set out in s66(1) of the LBCAA, I have had special regard to the desirability of preserving their setting. The appeal site forms part of the historic character of the riverside and contributes positively to the significance of these listed buildings. Nevertheless, given the scale of the proposed development, I consider that the proposal would preserve the setting of the listed buildings. I note the Council raised no concerns in this regard either.

Conclusion

19. The appeal proposal includes two different elements. I have concluded that the single storey rear extension to 63 Strand on the Green would not conflict with the development plan. However, I have concluded that the proposed roof extensions and associated works would harm the character and appearance of the CA.
20. Having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal in respect of the proposed roof extensions and associated works. However, I allow the appeal in respect of the single storey rear extension to 63 Strand on the Green.

C Skelly

INSPECTOR

¹ List Entry Number 1067522

² List Entry Number 1067523

³ List Entry Number 1067521