



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2020

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/19/3239763

65 Barrowgate Road, Chiswick, London W4 4QS

- 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 Sharon Fifer against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00079/65/P6, dated 24 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a roof extension and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling and the two other dwellings which form part of the terrace have complex and unusual roof structures, which incorporate hipped sections, a gable section and an area of flat roof. The roof of the appeal dwelling is however distinct to the roof of the other two dwellings, in terms of its scale and its height. Due to its hipped design, it also appears as visually separate from the roof of the other dwellings. Elsewhere on Barrowgate Road there is great variation in building designs and in their roof types, which gives the roofscape of the road a diverse character and appearance.
4. The proposed development would result in one side of the roof remaining as a hip and the other being gabled. In views taken of the property from the public domain, the proposed roof would appear as a dominant and incongruous feature, both in terms of the substantial brick gable that would result and in terms of the visual conflict between the hipped and gable roof structures that would be present on the appeal dwelling and adjoining terrace. Although it would not be prominent within the street scene, the proposed rear section of the roof would appear equally unbalanced with the same contrast between the hipped and gable structures. As a result of these factors, the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area.
5. Whilst there is a gable section of roof to No 65B at the other end of the terrace, this does not incorporate the full depth of the dwelling and it is inset into the

roof. Furthermore, its gable end is located behind the chimney stack of the dwelling. This feature is not therefore comparable to the scale of the roof extension subject to the appeal and it has little comparative impact upon the street scene. For these reasons, the appeal development would also not integrate well within the roofscape of the terrace of dwellings, when viewed as a whole. The appellant has drawn attention to other roofs in the vicinity and to a planning permission granted opposite the site. However, given the uniqueness of the roof structure of the appeal dwelling and the impact that would result from the proposal, the design of these other roofs does not outweigh or justify the harm that would arise from the appeal development.

6. The Council has raised concerns with regard to the front dormer window but the plans show that this would be consistent with the design and scale of those on the adjoining dwellings. However, this does not overcome the harm that would arise as a result of the appeal proposal, taken as a whole. The appellant has also drawn attention to the fact that the existing chimney would be raised in height as a result of the proposed development, to better match that of the adjoining dwelling, however this too does not overcome the harm that would be caused by the proposed development.
7. For these reasons, whilst I find that no harm would arise as a result of the proposed front dormer, I conclude that by reason of its design, size and scale, the proposed roof extension would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of both the dwelling itself and the surrounding area. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with the design aims of Policies SC7, CC1 and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 and the Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2017, all of which seek to safeguard character and appearance.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has advised that they sought pre-application advice prior to submitting the appeal proposal to the Council and that the reason for refusal given is identical to that of a previous planning application. I must however consider the merits of the case as I find it before me, and therefore whilst I can give limited weight to these matters, they do not outweigh the harm that I have identified. Although the dwelling is not a listed building or in a conservation area, this does not justify a harmful development.

Conclusion

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

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR