



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 20 July 2021

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/21/3268622

36 Spring Grove Crescent, Hounslow, TW3 4DB

- 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 Raj Patel against the decision of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01047/36/P1, dated 10 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a hip to gable and rear roof extension with a Juliet balcony and two front roof windows to the first floor flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a hip to gable and rear roof extension with a Juliet balcony and two front roof windows to the first floor flat at 36 Spring Grove Crescent, Hounslow, TW3 4DB, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 01047/36/P1, dated 10 October 2020, subject to the conditions below;
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No KS/70SC/P5; Drawing No KS/365SGC/P1; Drawing No KS/365SGC/P2A; KS/365SGC/P3; and KS/365SGC/P4A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. Having invited comments from the main parties, I have taken the description of development from the decision notice as this accurately reflects the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The proposed roof alterations would remove the existing symmetry between the appeal site and the attached property. This would be contrary to the SPD¹

¹ Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document A Guide for Householders

where it states such schemes will normally be refused. Nevertheless, it also states that an assessment on the impact of the extension on the street scene and character of the property will be made.

5. There is already considerable variety in the roofscape in the street. This includes several instances where there are differences within individual pairs of dwellings. Moreover, there are roof alterations of a similar scale and design to the appeal scheme nearby and that the appeal scheme would be seen with. As such, the roof scape and variances within the pair of properties would not appear alien or incongruous with the existing built form in the street.
6. Consequently, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It would accord with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan where they require developments to maintain and conserve the character of the area. While it would conflict with an element of the SPD, the scheme would comply with its aims to ensure designs are appropriate to their context and protect an area's character.

Other Matters

7. Whether the property is to be rented and the behaviour of the occupants of the site are not matters that alter my findings on the main issue. Given the position of the proposed works and the orientation of buildings there would be no significant impact on daylight or sunlight at adjacent properties.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard time limit condition, in the interests of certainty, a condition specifying the approved plans is required. To protect the character and appearance of the area, a condition requiring the external materials to match that of the existing property is imposed.

Conclusion

9. For the reason given above, I conclude that subject to the conditions above, the appeal should be allowed.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR