

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2016

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 2 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/16/3156494
14 Crosslands Avenue, Southall UB2 5QY

- 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 Harinder Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00328/14/P5, dated 7 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a roof to a side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for the erection of a roof to a side extension at 14 Crosslands Avenue, Southall UB2 5QY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00328/14/P5, dated 7 February 2016, 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 the following approved plans: PA3/PP/2504-01; PA3/PP/2504-02; PA3/PP/2504-03; PA3/PP/2504-04; PA3/PP/2504-05; PA3/PP/2504-06 and PA3/PP/2504-07.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the roof hereby permitted shall match those used in the pitched roof of the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. There are 2 separate appeals which relate to the property. These appeals have been assessed on their own individual planning circumstances.

Main Issue

3. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
-

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a much altered 2-storey semi-detached dwelling which includes a roof dormer, 2-storey side extension and a single storey rear extension. The property's original hipped roof has been altered to a gable roof form as part of the erection of the dormer. By reason of the alterations to the roof's existing form, from the surrounding roads the original symmetry of this pair of semi-detached dwellings has been materially changed. This unbalanced appearance is accentuated by the flat roof of the 2-storey extension.
5. The property is situated within a predominantly residential area of semi-detached dwellings which have been altered by the erection of side, rear or roof extensions. However, the dwellings' predominantly hipped roof forms have been retained. Where 2-storey side extensions have occurred they possess hipped roofs with the ridges either being similar to, or set down below, the original dwellings' ridge.
6. The proposed development includes the erection of a hipped roof above the existing 2-storey side extension. Planning permission has already been granted for a roof of similar design above the extension (Ref 00328/14/P4), including the angle of the slope reflecting the existing gable roof. However, the permission was granted before the appellant altered the form of the roof as part of erecting the dormer.
7. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: *Residential Extension Guidelines* (REG) provides advice on 2-storey side and first floor side extensions. However, this is a situation where an extension already exists and the proposed development is related to the erection of a different roof form. The REG's general guidance about the style and angle of a roof remain of relevance to assessing the proposed development, particularly any effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
8. As noted by the appellant, the flat roof of the 2-storey extension has an incongruous appearance within the streetscene where dwellings and extensions mainly possess hipped roofs. The abrupt and disjointed relationship between the property's gable roof and the flat roof of the side extension also contribute to the property being poorly related to the character and appearance of dwellings within the surrounding area. Further, the form of the gable roof contributes to the unbalancing and loss of symmetry of this pair of semi-detached dwellings.
9. Although there would be an awkward juxtaposition between the appeal scheme and the gable roof, the character and appearance of the property would be improved by the proposed development when compared to the current situation. The abrupt and disjointed relationship between the existing roofs would be mitigated by the appeal scheme. To some extent the erection of a hipped roof above the 2-storey extension would reinstate the property's original style of roof thereby both contributing to rebalancing the appearance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings and respecting the established character of other properties within the surrounding area.
10. Even with the proposed roof, the resulting 2-storey extension would remain secondary in size and appearance to the main part of the property. Further, the proposed style and angle of the proposed roof would reflect those of the

surrounding dwellings. It would, however, be appropriate to require the tiles used for the proposed roof to match those of the existing roof and this can be secured by a suitable condition.

11. The appellant has referred to matters such as the maintenance difficulties of flat roofs and similar extensions within the surrounding area, albeit their detailed planning circumstances have not been provided. Although regard has been had to these matters, they have been given only limited weight in the determination of this appeal because they do not materially affect the consideration of the main issue which has been identified.
12. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would not conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 and the general guidelines of the REG. Amongst other matters these policies require development to creatively respond to and maintain the character of the area, to respect the surrounding established context and to be of high quality urban design. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) core principle of securing high quality design.

Conditions

13. The Council has suggested a number of conditions in the event that this appeal was successful which have been assessed against the tests identified in the Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance. For reasons of proper planning and for the avoidance of any doubt, I agree with the Council that the proposed development should be constructed in accordance with the submitted drawings. Both for the reason already given and precision, the tiles of the proposed development should match those of the property's existing roof. Accordingly, and taking into account all other matters including the Framework's presumption in favour of sustainable development, it is concluded that this appeal should be allowed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR