

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 January 2017

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23rd August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3176976

25 Heathfield Gardens, Chiswick, London, W4 4JU

- 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 Ms Pauline Campbell against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref P/2016/5536, dated 9 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a side roof extension to both sides and a rear roof extension incorporating a front roof window to the house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is whether the proposed extensions would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Wellesley Road Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. No 25 Heathfield Gardens is a wide-fronted, two-storey detached house with a hipped roof, situated on the eastern side of the road, almost opposite to its junction with Grosvenor Road. The road is characterised by a mix of detached and semi-detached houses on its eastern side, with a mix of largely two- and three-storey semi-detached and terraced houses on the western side.
 4. The proposed development would involve the construction of a hipped-roof dormer extension to each side of the roof, and a larger, flat-roof dormer extension to the rear roof slope. There is a mix of hipped-roof and gable-roofed properties along the road, although the detached houses appear to be mainly characterised by having hipped roofs, and there are detached houses with hipped roofs at various points along the road, but side dormers on such roofs are not a feature in the street scene. In the context of its surroundings, therefore, I consider that side dormers would appear incongruous in the roofscape of Heathfield Gardens.
 5. The Council's Residential Extension Guidelines (REG) indicate that any rear roof extension in conservation areas should be modest in size and should be set down a metre from the ridge, up a metre up from the eaves and be less than
-

half the width of the roof face. The proposed rear roof dormer would not meet these requirements and would appear dominant and overbearing on the rear roof slope, harmful to the character and appearance of the host building. On this basis, it would therefore fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Wellesley Road Conservation Area (CA). In addition, the dormer would conflict with the Wellesley Road Conservation Area Appraisal Statement which suggests that large dormers should be avoided.

6. The appellant has noted that planning permission was granted for a rear dormer at the appeal property in 2015, and that a rear dormer was approved at No 36 Heathfield Gardens in the same year. From the information before me regarding these examples, it would appear that they would relate to somewhat smaller structures within the context of the roof slope and that they would accordingly be less overbearing in appearance. I have, in any case, dealt with this proposal on its own merits.
7. In conclusion, I find that the proposed side and rear extensions would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this case there are no public benefits to weigh against the harm.
8. On the basis of the above, the proposal would conflict with Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the Council's Local Plan, which require development, including residential extensions and alterations, to sustain, conserve and enhance areas of high quality design, including conservation areas, and to respond to the context of the host building and the surrounding area. It would also conflict with guidance in the REG.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR