

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2016

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20TH December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/16/3160419

105 Hatton Road, Feltham, Middlesex TW14 8LR

- 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 Gurinder Takhar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00576/105/P1 dated 12 May 2016 was refused by notice dated 6 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a proposed loft conversion with rear dormer with three velux windows to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a semi-detached property with a hipped roof. It is situated in a residential area which is predominately formed of, in the vicinity of the site, similar semi-detached buildings. The generally consistent roof forms and other features such as two storey bay windows gives the area a cohesive feel although a number of properties have been subject to alterations and extensions.
 4. The proposal seeks a hip to gable roof extension and a flat roof dormer to the rear. The change in the hip to gable element of the roof would unbalance this pair of properties, where the adjoining semi-detached property retains its hipped roof. The gable wall would be a dominant feature and result in a disproportionate bulk to the upper part of the property. Furthermore, the dormer would occupy almost the full width and height of the proposed roof and would dominate the appearance of the rear elevation, which is visible from Bishops Drive and Montrose Road. I consider that these elements of the development would detract significantly from the character and appearance of the host property alongside the adjoining semi and the area.
-

5. I am aware from the appellant's submission, and from my site visit, that there are other nearby properties which have been subject to similar developments with gable-end roofs and rear dormers. Whilst the full details and circumstances of these cases are not before me, these examples serve to demonstrate the harm that arises from alterations and extensions that result in the loss of symmetry at roof level between pairs of properties. In any event, each case must be assessed on its own merits.
6. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Council's Local Plan, which seek, amongst other matters, development that sensitively and creatively responds to an area's character and to refuse poor design. The proposal would also conflict with the *Residential Extension Guidelines* Supplementary Planning Guidance which seeks to ensure, amongst other matters, that roof extensions do not harm the appearance of the property or the area.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised including the lack of objections from surrounding residents and agreement of the landowner to the proposal, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR