



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2019

**by S Shapland BSc (Hons) MSc CMILT**

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

**Decision date: 16 December 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/19/3235433**

**16 Mandeville Road, Isleworth TW7 6AD**

- 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 Gehan Rajapakse against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
  - The application Ref 00727/16/P2, dated 22 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 09 July 2019.
  - The development proposed is hip to gable roof extension, and rear dormer window roof extension with 4no. new rooflights to front elevation.
- 

### 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 dwelling and the surrounding area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two storey semi detached dwelling located within a predominately residential area. Properties on Mandeville Road are characterised as being pairs of semi-detached dwellings, with predominately hipped roof styles. The appeal property has a two-storey side extension with a flat roof. The proposed hip to gable roof extension would stretch the full width of the host dwelling and replace this flat roof.
4. The Hounslow Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) states that with larger semi-detached dwellings, roof extensions should be set in by a metre from the side. Full width roof extensions are generally not acceptable as they create an overly boxy appearance to properties. The proposed roof extension would not be set in by the minimum distance, and as such it would add considerable bulk and mass which would not be subservient to the host dwelling.
5. I recognise that a degree of unbalancing of this pair of semi-detached dwellings exists due to the two-storey flat roof extension on the host dwelling. However, the proposal would unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings further due to the sizeable roof extension and difference in roof style which would be at odds with the existing hipped roof style at the adjacent property. Furthermore, the predominate roof type within the street scene is one of hipped roofs, and the conversion to a gable end would not be in keeping with this.

Notwithstanding the proposed materials which would complement the existing building, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

6. The appeal proposal includes a rear dormer extension which would span most of the width of the rear roof and would include Juliette balconies. Whilst there exists a number of rear dormer extensions in the vicinity, the proposed rear dormer due to its significant size would appear as an incongruous addition to the host dwelling. Furthermore, despite the Juliette balconies being aligned with the windows below, when viewed from the rear the proposal would not be in keeping with the adjacent property and would further unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties. I therefore find that the rear dormer would appear as an unacceptable feature.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of paragraphs in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) regarding sustainable development. The framework states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and goes on to advise that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area.
8. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. As such it conflicts with policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 – 2030 and the Council's SPD which seek, amongst other things, that residential extensions are of a high-quality design which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of an area. These policies are broadly consistent with the Framework relating to high quality design.

### **Other Matters**

9. The appellant accepts that due to its size the proposed development cannot be considered as permitted development but argues that as a fallback position the property benefits from a lawful development certificate<sup>1</sup> granted for the 'erection of a rear roof extension and extension of the roof to the side with roof windows to the front of the house'. This scheme is considerably smaller than the appeal proposal before me. Furthermore, the permitted scheme would maintain a hipped roof and would therefore be less of an incongruous addition to the property. Moreover, it would limit the effect of unbalancing with the neighbouring property. Therefore, limited weight can be given to this fallback position.
10. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of other developments in the area<sup>2</sup> including those at No.24 Mandeville Road and Nos.54 and 60 Taunton Avenue and considers that these have set a precedent. I have not been provided with the full details of the developments at No.24 Mandeville Road and No.54 Taunton Avenue, their date of construction or relationship to the development plan and the SPD. Thus, I cannot be sure that they are directly comparable to the particular set of circumstances at the appeal site. Furthermore, whilst details of No.60 Taunton Avenue have been provided<sup>3</sup>, the granting of this planning consent pre-dates the Council's SPD which was

---

<sup>1</sup> Ref: 00727/16/LAW2 Appendix C of the Appellant's Appeal Statement

<sup>2</sup> Appendix B of the Appellant's Appeal Statement

<sup>3</sup> Appendices B & E of the Appellant's Appeal Statement

adopted in December 2017. I have therefore afforded these extensions limited weight and determined the appeal proposal on its own merits having regard to the Development Plan, the Framework and other material considerations.

11. I acknowledge the appellant's reasons for requiring the proposed development including increased and enhanced accommodation for his family. However, such considerations do not outweigh the identified harm.
12. The lack of objections to the proposal does not influence my decision.

**Conclusion**

13. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*S Shapland*

INSPECTOR