

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 April 2017

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 8th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3170078

42 Flanders Road, Chiswick, London W4 1NG

- 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 & Mrs Moody against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow Council.
 - The application Ref 00455/42/P4, dated 9 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a rear dormer roof extension; removal of rear closet wing chimney stack; and conservation type roof light inserted into the front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Reasons

3. The property lies within the Bedford Park Conservation Area which is a predominantly residential area characterised by the general uniformity of the palette of materials overall, the varied but distinctive architectural detailing of the properties and the prevalence of street trees and garden vegetation.
 4. The Council's concern with regard to this proposal relates only to the rear dormer window. This would be a box style structure that would dominate the rear facing roof slope which faces the railway embankment. The combination of the scale, form and dominance of this new element would be entirely at odds with the detailing and form of the other architectural features that contribute positively to the distinctive and attractive character and appearance of this dwelling.
 5. Although the proposal would be to the back of the dwelling, it would be clearly evident from the train line to the rear. Although there have been many changes to the backs of these houses, there are only a limited number of additions such as this that would be prominent in either public views or those from the railway. The proposal would represent poor design in this particular context and would detract from the character and appearance of the dwelling. It would
-

fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.

6. The proposal would conflict with the requirements of Policies SC7, CC1 and CC4 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030, particularly as it would fail to sensitively and creatively responds to the character of the area; would represent poor quality design; and would not conserve or take the opportunity to enhance the conservation area. As these policies generally accord with the design and heritage requirements of the *National Planning Policy Framework*, I afford them considerable weight. The *Framework* is also clear that permission should be refused for development of poor design.
7. The Council's Residential Extension Guidelines 2003: Supplementary Planning Guidance document accepts box style rear dormers but seeks to restrict their size so that they do not dominate the rear roof slope. It also requires that they are central and set in from the edge of the roof and have windows that match the size of those below. It is a document of some age that no longer relates to the current development plan policies. The proposal would conflict with the guidelines but I afford the document limited weight in these circumstances.
8. It is not in dispute that other properties have had roof extensions, although it is not clear whether any that are of this scale and design have been permitted since the adoption of the current development plan policies. The character of the area has not changed to the extent that an addition such as this would be in keeping. I agree with the appellants that this proposal would have limited prominence from the neighbouring gardens but its prominence from the railway would be of more significance. Overall, the matters offered in support of the proposal provide very limited weight in its favour.
9. The *Framework* is clear that any harm to a heritage asset, such as a conservation area, should be weighed against the public benefits. The harm to the conservation area would be less than substantial, as described in paragraph 134 of the guidance, but I am not satisfied that there are any public benefits sufficient to outweigh the harm that would result. It would therefore conflict with the heritage requirements of the *Framework*.
10. The matters put forward by the appellants are not sufficient to outweigh my concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR