



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 August 2020

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3252381

18 Market Place, Brentford TW8 8EQ

- 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 Alberto Williams against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00737/18/P1, dated 13 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion providing bedroom with an en-suite by forming a full gable to replace the hipped roof and 2 roof-lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this 3 storey, end-of-terrace property, which is located within The Butts Conservation Area. The terrace is of a modern design, said to have been constructed in 2013/14. The end properties have shallow hipped roofs, whilst the others within this terrace of 5 have full-width roofs, also of a similar shallow pitch.
4. Policies CC1 and CC2 of the Local Plan seek to promote high quality urban design and ensure that the qualities and heritage of an area are conserved or enhanced. Policy CC4 makes specific reference to ensuring that the significance of heritage assets are not unreasonably affected. Policy SC7 relates to residential extensions and refers to detailed guidance set out in Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD).
5. The Council's Residential Extensions Guidance was adopted by the Council in 2017 as SPD. With reference to roof extensions, it indicates that, in general, extensions which replace a hipped roof with an end gable will be refused. The SPD makes it clear that this advice is applicable to terraced properties, as well as others. Its specific guidance in relation to conservation areas states that such extensions will not normally be acceptable.

6. The existing building forms part of an attractive and intimate streetscape which also presents views at the rear from areas close to the nearby canal and its associated conservation area. The hipped roof at the appeal site sits adjacent to the hipped roof at the neighbouring building. Although the neighbouring building is of a different overall design, it is of a similar height and its shallow hipped roof is broadly similar.
7. The hipped roof design at either end of this short terrace help to balance the overall composition of the building and provide some separation between the roofs of this and the adjacent property. I consider that the proposal would appear visually awkward and would disrupt the balanced appearance of the terrace. It would appear dominant within the existing gap at roof level between this and the adjacent building. In this way the proposal would have a harmful effect on the area, failing to either preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.
8. The appellant makes reference to pre-application advice from the Council and I have a copy of this. It appears to relate to a different design then proposed but some reference is made to a gable extension by the Council, although it is a guarded comment and certainly not an unreserved commendation of such a proposal. The appellant also indicates that the advice in the SPD mainly relates to semi-detached properties. Although the associated illustration does show a pair of semi-detached houses, clear reference is made to the Council's view that such extensions would not normally be acceptable on terraced properties as well.
9. I have taken account of all other matters raised in the representation and conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the conservation area and would be contrary to Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the Local Plan as well as the guidance in the SPD. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

ST Wood

INSPECTOR