



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 August 2020

by M Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3249103

7 Beeston Way, Feltham TW14 0EU

- 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 Najma Yousafzai against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00101/7/P4, dated 16 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as "Rear extension to align with existing and hip-to-gable loft conversion existing semi detached property. Loft conversion compliant with permitted development regulations".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Within the context of an appeal under section 78 of the Act it is not within my remit to formally determine whether part of the proposed development requires planning permission as claimed by the appellant. If the appellant wishes to ascertain whether part of the development would be lawful, they may make an application under section 191 of the Act
3. The scheme includes an extension to the ground floor at the rear, the Council's Officer's report identifies no harm in respect of this element of the proposals. I have therefore confined my consideration below to the hip-to-gable extension and the rear dormer extension.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal building comprises an end-of-terrace, two-storey dwelling with parking area to the front. It lies within a residential street which consists of both semi-detached and terraced properties which are similarly designed, with the use of hipped roofs a defining feature of the street. The property forms part of a terrace which sits at the end of the road and as a consequence, is a highly visible and prominent feature of the area.
6. The scheme seeks to amend the hipped roof of the property to form a gable. This would essentially "square off" the roof. Given the defining characteristic of hipped roofs that I have identified above, the scheme would introduce an alien roof form

- into the locality, that would be a discordant addition to the appearance of the building as well as the surrounding area. It would thus be a harmful alteration.
7. To the rear roof plane, a dormer addition is proposed, which would extend over the proposed hip-to-gable extension. I note that the Council highlight that this addition would not comply with the guidance of the London Borough of Hounslow Residential Extension Guidelines – Supplementary Planning Document A Guide for Householders (2017) (the SPD), in that it would not be set down from the ridge, or be sufficiently set up from the eaves. Nonetheless, the extension would be set in from the sides of the roof and there would be a nominal set up from the eaves. As such, whilst there would be a technical non-compliance with the requirements of the guidance, given the position to the rear together with the presence of a much larger dormer extension to the neighbouring property, I find that the proposed dormer extension would not be overly bulky, would include elements of subservience and would not overwhelm the rear roof plane. Notwithstanding that I do not find this element of the scheme objectionable, it would rely on the hip-to-gable extension.
 8. While I find the rear dormer extension acceptable in isolation, the hip-to-gable extension would be an incongruous and harmful addition, resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Thus, the scheme would conflict with policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan, (2015-2030), insofar as they seek to ensure that development sensitively responds to a sites characteristics and an area's character, as well as that extensions to residential properties are not harmful to the character or appearance of the building. While I have found that the rear dormer would conflict with the guidance of the SPD but would in any event be acceptable, the hip-to-gable would also conflict with the guidance of the SPD, but in that case non-compliance with the guidance would result in the harm which I have identified above.
 9. As referred to above, I note the appellants comments that the hip-to-gable loft conversion could be constructed under permitted development. The appellant consequently contends that permission has already been granted for the proposal by The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. Notwithstanding, I have no information before me that confirms this, i.e. there is no indication that a Certificate of Lawfulness has been sought. In any event, as I have set out above, it is not within the remit of this appeal to determine whether a scheme would be permitted development or not. Accordingly, I have judged the appeal on the basis of its planning merits and found it to be unacceptable. Whether or not the scheme would be permitted development is not a matter which is before me. My determination of this appeal would not affect the appellants ability to undertake elements that may benefit from permitted development. I therefore find this matter is not of sufficient weight to outweigh the conflict with policy.

Conclusion

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

Martin Allen

INSPECTOR