
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 November 2016

by Patrick Whelan BA(Hons) Dip Arch MA MSc ARB RIBA RTPI

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

Decision date: 11 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/16/3159423
35 Warfield Road, Feltham TW14 8AD

- 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 Mrs Marinela Bogescu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01168/35/P4, dated 27 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side & rear extension, new crown roof with addition of first floor & repositioning of front doors & windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side & rear extension, new crown roof with addition of first floor & repositioning of front doors & windows at 35 Warfield Road, Feltham TW14 8AD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 01168/35/P4, dated 27 May 2016, and the plans submitted with it, 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 approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans: SITE LOCATION PLAN dated 15/1/2016; BLOCK/SITE PLAN dated 15/1/2016; 1:1 Existing & Proposed Floor Plans; 1:2 Proposed Roof Plan; 1:3 Existing Elevations; 1:4 Proposed Elevations.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character of the surrounding street scene.

Reasons

3. The bungalow the subject of this appeal stands on the corner of two roads which contain bungalows and houses of various designs but which share broadly similar footprints, heights and building lines. The Council objects to the crown roof of the proposed development, concluding that its increased height, pitch, and resultant mass would be overbearing and obtrusive on the corner plot.
 4. The appellant refers to a permission given this year for a similar development as that proposed in this case but with a shallower roof-pitch and a ridge 600mm lower. I acknowledge that the uplift of 600mm to the ridge in this
-

proposal would increase the overall mass and height of the roof; however it would be similar to the height of the ridge of the bungalow immediately to the north, and similar in height to many other roofs over the bungalows in the surrounding area. The height of the proposal in relation to the walls below eaves and in relation to the surrounding buildings would not appear out of place with the surrounding bungalows. I note that the pitch of the roof would be steeper in this proposal than in the consented roof, however it would not appear so steep as to be out of character with the house or with the other bungalow roof forms on the surrounding plots.

5. I appreciate the Council's point that there are no crown roofs on the surrounding bungalows. However, the form of the proposed roof would not appear substantially different to that already consented. While the steeper pitch would make the crown of the roof wider, its impact would not be harmful in the roofscape of the house or at odds with the character of the houses in the surrounding street scene, which while they do not contain crowns, contain a variety of roof forms.
6. Despite the uplift and increase in pitch, I conclude that the proposal would not be overbearing in relation to other buildings or obtrusive in the overall roofscape of the area. There would be no conflict with Policies SC7, CC1 and CC2 of the Local Plan 2015-2030 which seek development that takes opportunities to enhance qualities that contribute to an area's character, respond sensitively to the grain and massing of surrounding buildings, and complement the original building, harmonise with adjoining properties and maintain the character of the general street scene.

Conditions and Conclusion

7. The Council has suggested a number of conditions which it considers would be appropriate were I minded to allow the appeal. I have considered them in the light of the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the statutory time condition and in the interests of proper planning and for the avoidance of doubt, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
8. However, as the application form specifies the proposed materials, some of which differ from the materials of the existing building, I have not applied a condition for matching materials. Nor given the block corner location of the site, the provisions to protect the living conditions of neighbours under permitted development and the configuration of the plot and its relationship to neighbouring plots is it necessary to make the development acceptable to impose a condition preventing further openings in the walls and roof slopes.
9. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Patrick Whelan

INSPECTOR