



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 August 2017

by C J Ford BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

a person appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 16th August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3177329

12A Vine Place, Hounslow, London TW3 3UE

- 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 P Lal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01157/12A/P2, dated 8 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 2 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is a front dormer.
-

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 wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a small two storey mid-terrace house. It forms part of 'back to back' terraces in a literal sense with two terraces accommodated within one long building which are housed under a single dual pitched roof. Owing to the orientation of the building, the front of the terrace that incorporates the appeal property is not visible from Vine Place. However, the roof is visible in public views from the entrance to a surface level car park that is accessed from Bell Road. Given there have been no additions to the original roof form, it currently has a visually pleasing degree of harmony and continuity.
4. Section 5.0 of the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines 2003 specifies that, as a guide, any roof extension to a terraced house should be set at least 0.3m below the ridge level, at least 0.5m above the eaves level and at least 0.5m from the sides of the roof. Roof extensions that would be as wide as the house and create the appearance of a large box will be refused permission. Where the roof can be extended, the Council will recommend that you build a small dormer window extension.
5. The proposed dormer would not be set below the ridge level and it would not be set in from the sides. It would only be set in a small degree above the eaves. As a consequence, it would have the appearance of a large box that the guidelines caution against. The excessively bulky addition would be visually

intrusive as it would result in the house having an incongruous top heavy appearance and it would significantly disrupt the existing harmony and continuity of the roof form to the wider terrace.

6. The benefit of the proposal in terms of the provision of additional living accommodation is acknowledged, particularly given the expressed personal circumstances of the appellant. However, this consideration does not outweigh the identified harm.
7. It is therefore concluded that the proposal would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area. It would conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Council's Local Plan 2015. Amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that developments complement the original building, harmonise with adjoining properties and respect the surrounding established context.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

C J Ford

APPOINTED PERSON