

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2019

**by Karen Taylor MSC URP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: Wednesday, 23 October 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/19/3233204**  
**34 Montrose Road, Feltham TW14 8LP**

- 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 Natalie Fernandes against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
  - The application Ref 00772/34/P1, dated 8 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 June 2019.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a side roof extension to first floor flat.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matter

2. Within the information before me, references have been made to the draft London Plan (2017). Whilst I have had regard to these, their weight in my decision has been limited on account of the Panel report recommendations.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal site is a first floor flat located within a two-storey residential property. The site forms part of a pair of semi-detached properties of similar appearance in width, characterised with identical features including hipped roofs. It is located within a predominantly residential area and positioned on the junction of Montrose Road and Hatton Road. Despite some variation in form, the properties in the area present a discreet arrangement that appreciably contributes towards the local character.
5. The proposed roof extension would extend the hipped roof of the property to form a gable roof which would facilitate a large rear dormer extension. The gable roof would result in an excessive length of the roof ridge across the host property and would create an unbalanced, bulky and negative appearance to these symmetrical properties. Furthermore, the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (SPD), at section 4.10 advises that the conversion of a sloped hip-end roof into a flat gable end roof

- on the side will normally be refused. Accordingly, it would detract from the character and appearance of both properties and the street scene.
6. The rear dormer would be of a flat roof but would span across almost the whole of the rear roof on the north east elevation. Despite the limited inset from the roof slope and ridge, due to the substantial width, length, and positioning of the dormer on the roof it would appear as a bulky and dominant feature, overpowering the roof form and would not appear as a subservient addition. It would also fail to meet the Council's SPD guidance as its appearance on the roof would reflect that of a large box.
  7. Although there is spacing between the property and the boundaries of the site the rear elevation of the roof, that being to the north east elevation is clearly visible along Montrose Road from various points within the street scene. Whilst the side of the property along the south west elevation is also visible from along Hatton Road. The proposed dormer would be a substantial addition to the roof and would appear as an incongruous addition to the host property when viewed from both these roads. It would therefore be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.
  8. I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would be contrary to Policies SC7, CC1 and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015, which seeks development to maintain the character of an area and respond to any local architectural vernacular that contributes to an area's character. It would also be at odds with the design guidance contained within the Council's SPD for roof extensions.

### **Other Matters**

9. I have been referred to other roof alterations within the vicinity of the site. However, I do not have full details of these schemes and so cannot be certain that the circumstances are the same. In any event, those that I saw do not change the prevailing character of the area in order to justify the development before me. In any case I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits.
10. Although the proposed development would meet room space requirements and not cause any harm to the living conditions of neighbouring properties on Montrose Road, these matters do not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance I have found.

### **Conclusion**

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

*Karen Taylor*

INSPECTOR