

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 March 2017

by Tim Belcher FCII, LLB (Hons), Solicitor (Non-Practising)

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

Decision date: 06 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/16/3165362

57 Great South West Road, Hounslow, TW4 7NH

- 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 Dr Raj Bhatnagar ("the Appellant") against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow ("the Council").
 - The application Ref 00504/57/P3, dated 1 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is a loft extension to rear and side with roof-lights to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Policy

2. The Development Plan for the area includes Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 to 2030 ("the Local Plan").
3. The Local Plan explains, amongst other things, that:
 - a) The Council promotes and supports a high standard of urban design for all development. This applies to small scale householder development including extensions and alterations. The cumulative impact of these many minor developments can have a significant impact and therefore policies for design will apply in all cases.
 - b) The Council will support the extension and improvement of residential properties provided the alterations maintain the character of the area.
 - c) The Council will require that alterations and additions do not harm the existing character and appearance of the building or its context.
 - d) The Council will expect development proposals to complement the original building, harmonise with adjoining properties and maintain the character of the general street-scene.

Main Issue

4. I consider the main issue in this case is the impact of part of the dormer extension on the character and appearance of No. 57 and the street-scene.

Reasons

5. The development has been carried out and comprises additions and alterations to the roof of No. 57 to accommodate habitable accommodation within the former roof-space. The accommodation includes a bedroom with an en-suite

shower room. So as to provide this accommodation the roof has been extended and altered to the rear, side and front including the construction of an "L" shaped dormer and the provision of roof-lights.

6. No. 57 is one of a pair of semi-detached dwelling-houses (Nos. 57 & 55) that front on to a major highway known as the Great South West Road. Prior to the development being carried out the prominent features of this pair of dwellings were the two-storey bay windows and the hipped roofs over the main house and bay windows.
7. There are about 12 pairs of semi-detached houses (Nos. 19 to 65 (odd only)) in what I consider to be a cohesive group of dwellings. I will refer to the group of houses identified above as "the Relevant Street-Scene". Various additions and alterations have been carried out to individual dwellings within the Relevant Street-Scene but the majority of houses still retain some of their original characteristics and styles namely:
 - a) Being two-storeys in height.
 - b) Having two-storey bay window with roofs over. The roofs over the bay windows protrude above the eaves line of the main roof.
 - c) Having hipped roofs over the pairs of semi-detached dwellings.
 - d) Generally, sharing a pleasing symmetry in terms of design.
8. There have been alterations and additions to some of the individual dwellings within the Relevant Street-Scene. These changes include:
 - a) Porches.
 - b) Changes to the styles of windows.
 - c) Two of the dwellings have two-storey side extensions which are subordinate to the host dwelling.
 - d) Three of the dwellings have had their hip roofs altered to form gable roofs.
 - e) Some of the houses have had their brickwork exteriors rendered.
9. Part of the dormer extension at No. 57 (that part which runs parallel to the side elevation of the dwelling) has been built so that it sits forward of the roof slope of the main roof. I will refer to this part of the dormer as "the Protruding Dormer". In my assessment the Protruding Dormer:
 - a) Creates an incongruous addition to the form and appearance of the roof at No. 57.
 - b) Juts in front of the main ridge line and its flat roof and bulky appearance creates an unattractive feature that spoils the composition of the main roof over Nos. 57 and 55.
 - c) Fails to harmonise with the style of the:
 - i) Roof at No. 55.
 - ii) Roofs of any of the dwellings within the Relevant Street-Scene.

10. I am aware that had hip to gable extension been built under permitted development rights at No. 57 this would have also had a dramatic impact on the appearance of Nos. 57 and 55. As explained above there are other examples of hip to gable extensions within the Relevant Street-Scene and whilst these have had a significant impact on the symmetry of the pairs of semi-detached houses concerned they may have been permitted development.
11. I conclude, for the reasons explained above, that the Protruding Dormer has a materially adverse impact on the character and appearance of No. 57, the pair of dwellings which No. 57 forms part of and the Relevant Street-Scene. Accordingly, the Protruding Dormer fails to accord with the relevant parts of the Local Plan.

Other Matters

12. I understand that a hip to gable extension at No. 57 would not have allowed sufficient headroom to accommodate some of the additional accommodation sought by the Appellant. I do not consider that is a sufficient reason to grant planning permission for development that results in material harm and does not accord with the Local Plan.
13. I am also aware of the side dormer to a residential property on the opposite side of Great South West Road which has been built within the hipped roof slope of No. 66. The Council have indicated that the side dormer at No. 66 does not benefit from planning permission although it is likely to be lawful given that it has been in place for over ten years. This dormer has very little impact on the character or appearance of the Relevant Street-Scene.
14. I also saw the front dormer extension at No. 121 which is within a terrace of dwellings. However, that dormer is a significant distance away from No. 57 and the Relevant Street-Scene. Accordingly, I do not consider the dormer at No. 121 is a justification for the Protruding Dormer at No. 57.
15. Finally, I am aware of and saw several rear dormers at other nearby properties as well as photographs of dormer extensions elsewhere in the Borough but these do not appear to me to result in any harm to the character or appearance of the dwellings concerned or the area within which they are situated.

Overall Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Tim Belcher

Inspector