



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2020 by Ben Phillips Bsc Msc

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/19/3240731

1A Worton Road, Isleworth TW7 6HJ.

- 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 Mohamed Khan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01239/1A/P3, dated 23 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a "Hip-to-gable conversion of existing semi-detached house, including infill of first floor terrace, dormer window to rear and rooflights".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property, semi-detached unit to which it relates and surrounding area, with particular regard to the design of the hip to gable conversion.

Reasons for Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached dwelling located prominently on the curve of Worton Road, set back from the highway. It comprises one half of a pair of semi-detached dwellings and whilst not entirely symmetrical due to the side projection of No 1A, the pair of dwellings are characterised by their hipped roof design.
5. The proposed roof extension would result in the change in design of the roof from a hip to a gable. The proposed gable design, sitting adjacent to the hipped roof of its adjacent and adjoining neighbours, would appear out of keeping with the symmetrical form of development in the locality, and would unbalance the existing semi-detached unit to which it relates. It would also detract from the character and appearance of the existing property. As a consequence, the proposal would erode the contribution that the host property and its attached neighbour make to the character and appearance of the area.

6. Whilst Nos 1C – 1F Worton Road have gable roof designs, they reflect the symmetrical character of the area, which the proposal taken with its attached neighbour would not achieve. I note the suggestion that No 1B could have a similar designed roof constructed under permitted development rights, however there is no substantive evidence before me to indicate that this would occur, nor a mechanism to secure such development. Limited weight is therefore given to this matter in my consideration of this appeal.
7. In light of the foregoing, I conclude that the proposed hip to gable extension would detract from and be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property, the semi-detached unit to which it relates, and the surrounding area. The proposal conflicts with the aims of Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Local Plan 2015-2030 Volume One which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development proposals are of a high standard of design that is sensitive to local character and that of the principal building. The proposal would also be contrary to the guidance on roof extensions set out in the Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Extension Guidelines' (2017).
8. In reaching this conclusion I am mindful that planning permission has been granted at appeal¹ to extend the property to the side, however the roof of this extension reflects the hipped roof character of the dwelling and its attached neighbour, which the appeal proposal does not.
9. I acknowledge that the proposal would provide the appellant and his family additional living accommodation and the suggestion that the proposal would improve the existing housing stock. Although the proposal would increase the floor space of the host dwelling, this does not justify harmful development. The absence of harm to nearby occupiers' living conditions is a neutral consideration in this case and does not alter the conclusion that I have reached.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR

¹ Appeal reference APP/F5540/D/19/3231305