

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2017

**by G J Fort BA PGDip LLM MCD MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 28 February 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/16/3163840**  
**88A Heston Road, Hounslow, TW5 0QP**

- 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 N Kailey against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
  - The application Ref 00600/88A/P3, dated 5 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 September 2016.
  - The development proposed is a loft conversion including dormer windows and first floor part front glass room to be replaced with cavity wall and a window.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues in this appeal to be the effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance of its host dwelling and its surroundings.

### Reasons

3. The appeal building is a detached dwelling, principally of two-storeys. Its environs are predominantly residential, though with a school and church in the wider surroundings, and comprise a mixture of types and scale of dwelling. The appeal building, like its immediate neighbours is hipped roofed and set back from the road. A hipped roof gable projects from its front elevation, however, the gap between this and the building's principal roof is partially in-filled at first floor by a lean-to glazed structure with a shallow pitched roof, described as a 'glass room' in the description of development. Wide side spaces separate the appeal property from its neighbours.
  4. The appeal scheme would replace the glass room at first floor on the front elevation with a cavity wall. A crown roof would replace the existing hipped one, which would extend over the area of the first floor previously occupied by the glass room. Roof lights would be inserted in the front roof-slope, and box dormers inserted on the rear and both side roof slopes.
  5. The scale and bulk of the proposed roof, extending as it would over the area currently occupied by the glass room, combined with the proposal to replace the glazing of this lightweight structure with more substantial walling, would erode the prominence of the appeal dwelling's existing gable projection to a
-

significant degree. The scale of the roof would be increased considerably and, combined with its bulk, would be a much more dominant element of the building than the existing roof; and as a consequence would be at jarring variance with the proportions of its ground and first floors. As a result, the proposed development would be insensitive to the proportions and balance of the host dwelling and thus cause considerable harm to its character and appearance.

6. Due to the separation distances between the appeal building and its adjacent properties the proposed development would be widely visible in the streetscene. Consequently, the steep pitches and dominant bulk of its roof would read as a discordant contrast to the roofs of the immediately neighbouring properties. The proposed development's incongruity in this regard would thus be of considerable harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene.
7. Whilst I note that there are dormers in the wider streetscene, I saw none that were part of comprehensive alterations to the roof similar to those proposed by the appeal scheme. Consequently, the presence of dormers in the environs of the site does not alter my conclusions regarding the overall dominance and incongruity of the proposed development taken as a whole. I note that the proposed development would remove the first floor glass room. However, due to the harmful effects that the proposed development would cause this would not constitute an improvement to the streetscene.
8. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would cause considerable harm to the character and appearance of its host dwelling and surroundings. As a result it would conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan (adopted September 2015); and Hounslow's Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Guidance (adopted October 2003). Taken together, and amongst other things, the policies and guidance seek to ensure that development responds to local character and context, and that extensions and alterations complement the character and appearance of their host buildings, and those of the wider surroundings.

### **Other Matters**

9. I note that the proposed development could secure more space for the appellant and his family, and that it could be economically prohibitive to move elsewhere. However, in the overall planning balance, these matters do not outweigh the considerable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings that would be caused by the proposed development.

### **Conclusion**

10. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan insofar as the policies that have been drawn to my attention are concerned. No material considerations outweigh this conflict. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

*G J Fort*

INSPECTOR