
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2017

by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDurp MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23RD November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3180807

1 Worple Avenue, Isleworth TW7 7JJ

- 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 Miklos Mogyorossy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01235/1/P5, dated 3 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion and rear extension.
-

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 building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two storey, hipped roofed end of terrace dwelling located within an estate of similarly designed dwellings, most of which incorporate hipped roofs including the dwelling at the other end of the terrace. The host building fronts the road and its rear elevation is clearly visible from Crane Avenue, from an access road to the rear and from nearby dwellings. At my site visit I noted that dormer extensions do not appear to be prevalent within the area.
4. The proposal would result in the loss of the existing hipped roof and its replacement with a pitched gable. Consequently the proposal would unbalance the terrace and would be at odds with and be harmful to the character of the immediate surrounding area which mainly comprises hipped roofs.
5. The proposed rear dormer is large in size and it would span almost the entire width of the rear roof slope of the host building. Though it would be set in from the side of the roof, set down from the ridge and up from the eaves, having regard to its overall size and width it would nevertheless be a bulky, dominant and incongruous addition to the host building. Both main parties appear to agree that the proposed dormer breaches the Council's guidelines for such extensions and notwithstanding that it would be constructed from matching materials and that the appeal site is not within a conservation area,

it would significantly alter the character and appearance of the host building and would be clearly visible from Crane Avenue.

6. My attention has been drawn by the appellant to examples of other similar extensions nearby at 38 Worple Avenue (Ref 01235/38/LAW1) and at 3 Northcote Avenue. I have been provided with photographs of these sites and with a copy of the Council's decision notice relating to application number 01235/38/LAW1 for a certificate of lawful use or development at No 38. At my site visit I noted that unlike the host building which forms part of a terrace, these properties are both semi-detached dwellings. I also note that the development at No 38 was the subject of an application for a lawful development certificate and not for planning permission as is the case with the proposal. In addition it is not clear from the evidence whether these examples include rear dormer extensions. I have therefore attached limited weight to these other examples as they do not appear to be directly comparable and in any event I must determine the proposal before me on its own merits.
7. In reaching my decision I note that the Council raised no objections to the form and position of the proposed two storey rear extension forming part of the proposal. Whilst I have no reason to disagree with the Council's conclusion on this issue, the extension forms an integral part of the proposal and is not severable from the proposed roof extensions. I also note that the proposal would result in a larger rear garden for the host building but this benefit would not outweigh that harm that I have identified.
8. Taking the above matters into consideration, I conclude that the proposal would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. It is therefore contrary to policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan and with relevant guidance contained within the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines adopted July 2002 and updated January 2007. These policies and this guidance seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development proposals including roof extensions are well designed in relation to the host building and respond to their context. Though not referred to in the Council's reason for refusal, the proposal would also be contrary to relevant guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Beverley Wilders

INSPECTOR