
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 September 2016

by **C L Humphrey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 22nd September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/16/3157412

25 Clitherow Road, Brentford, London TW8 9JT

- 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 and Mrs Ivanovic against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00285/25/P4, dated 23 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is “Loft conversion including roof extensions. New windows and rooflights”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The site address given on the application form is 25 Clitherow Avenue. However, it is clear from the submitted Location Plan that the address is actually 25 Clitherow Road. I have therefore taken the site address from the Council’s decision notice rather than the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed roof extensions upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is located at the north-west end of a row of 4 terraced houses within a street of similar properties. Like the house at the south-east end of the row, the main roof of the appeal property has an unaltered hipped end whilst there is a pitched roof with a gable end over the rear outrigger. The ridge of the outrigger is lower than that of the main house, and it thus appears as a subordinate feature.
 5. The appeal proposal would alter the existing hipped roof over the main house to a gable and would add a large dormer roof extension to the main rear roof slope. A second roof extension would be added to the outrigger, connecting to the rear dormer roof extension. The proposed gable roof would significantly alter the form of the existing roof and would consequently unbalance the terrace as a whole. The rear dormer would dominate the extended roof slope, and have a bulky, top-heavy appearance.
-

6. The proposed roof extension above the outrigger would be of a modest width and depth. However, it would extend significantly higher than the existing outrigger ridge line and, when combined with the proposed dormer extension to the rear of the main roof slope, would create an awkward and discordant feature which would fail to respect the existing architectural form and proportions of the appeal property.
7. My attention has been drawn to a number of hip to gable extensions and rear dormers on the main roofs at 2, 8, 16 and 39 Clitherow Road. I do not have full details of the planning history of these developments, although I have been provided with a copy of a lawful development certificate in respect of No 8. In any event, I have determined the appeal on its own merits.
8. Examples of roof extensions to outriggers in the street have also been brought to my attention. However, I am not aware of the full planning history of these developments and I have not been provided with copies of the approved plans and elevations. I therefore have no evidence that planning permission has been granted for roof extensions to outriggers which terminate higher than the existing ridge line. I have reached my conclusions on the appeal proposal on the basis of the evidence before me.
9. It has been demonstrated that a hip to gable extension and rear dormer extension to the main roof slope of the appeal property could be carried out without the need for planning permission on the basis of a scheme for which a lawful development certificate Ref 00285/25/LAW was issued on 11 July 2016. However, that scheme would not be as substantial as the appeal proposal before me since it would not include the creation of an extension to the roof of the outrigger. Therefore, I can afford this fallback position only limited weight.
10. Taking the above matters into consideration, I conclude that the proposed roof extensions would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. As such, the appeal proposal would be contrary to the design aims of Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C L Humphrey

INSPECTOR