

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2016

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date:

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/16/3158197
14 Osterley Crescent, Isleworth TW7 5LF

- 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 Miss Kathryn Elliott against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow Council.
 - The application Ref 00841/14/P3, dated 6 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 September 2016.
 - The description of operational development proposed is for a hip to gable rear roof extension with two front windows to the house.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the semi-detached pair of dwellings of which it forms part, and whether the proposal would conserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Spring Grove Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated within the Spring Grove Conservation Area which is characterised by low density, predominantly two storey semi-detached houses separated by quite wide streets. The majority of houses within the street appear to have been originally built with hipped roofs, though a number have been subjected to hip to gable extensions, including 12 Osterley Crescent adjacent to the south west. The appeal property has had a side dormer constructed to its roof with 16 Osterley Crescent, adjoining and having a similar such feature, although the original hipped roof form is still apparent on both dwellings from the street.
4. The Council's Residential Extension Guidelines (2003) (REG) in Section 5 state that any roof extension will have a big impact on the appearance of a house and the surrounding area; and where one proposes to convert a sloped hip-end roof into a flat gable-end roof on the side of a house, permission will normally be refused. This is because it would unbalance, amongst other things, the appearance of a pair of semi-detached houses. I note within the appellant's submissions that it is highlighted that the proposal, the subject of this appeal,

was part of a joint application; however, the documentation before me only makes reference to no 14 and I can only deal with the appeal on this basis.

5. I have acknowledged above that some properties have undergone hip to gable roof extensions, although I have been provided with very limited planning history on these, in any event, each case must be assessed on its own merits. Notwithstanding this I can understand the appellant's frustration with what they perceive to be an inconsistency in decision making by the Council. However, I must assess the proposal against the development plan whilst taking into account all material considerations.
6. Whilst in its self the proposed extension is of an appropriate architectural quality, it cannot be assessed in isolation, and would quite clearly unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings of which it forms part. This would give rise to an incongruent feature within the street scene and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
7. With respect to the other key element of the proposal, the appeal property currently has a modest flat roof dormer to its rear elevation and, again one has been similarly constructed to the rear of no 16. With reference to the REG, it is highlighted that it is important to make the size of such extensions secondary to the size of the roof face within which it would be set and that roof extensions that would be as wide as the house and create the appearance of a large box will be refused permission. Whilst I note that there would be a 0.45m gap to the Party Wall, the proposed dormer would be built off of the main ridgeline and would be flush with the flank elevation, as well as the rear eaves. The REG highlights that on larger semi-detached houses the set-ins from the ridge, eaves and sides of the roof should be at least 1m. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to the REG and I conclude that the proposed rear dormer, by virtue of its overall scale, would appear overly dominant to the original roof and would also fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
8. I find the proposal is contrary to Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan which require development to reflect the REG, complement the original building, harmonise with adjoining properties and maintain the character of the general street scene; as well as sustaining and preserving those areas which have a high quality, well established and coherent character, in addition to preserving and enhancing the Borough's network of Designated Heritage Assets.

Conclusion

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

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR