

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2021 by A Coombes

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/21/3281919

28 College Road, Isleworth TW7 5DW

- 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 S Lall against the decision of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00294/28/P3, dated 17 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is ground floor and roof level extension and associated works.
-

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 Council found no harm in respect of the ground floor extension or the roof extension insofar as it relates to the side facing dormer, and I have no reason to disagree. Therefore, the main issue is whether the roof level alterations to the rear outrigger would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Spring Grove Conservation Area (SGCA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a two-storey front bay window. It is constructed in brick with white pebbledash render and is located within the SGCA. The surrounding area is residential with inward facing rear gardens from nearby streets. The proposal seeks permission for a ground floor and roof level extension with associated works. This appeal decision will solely deal with the proposed roof level alterations to the rear outrigger.
5. The proposed rear roof alterations would significantly change the character of the existing roof and cause an imbalance between the outrigger roof of the appeal site and adjoining 26 College Road. Though the ridge height would not be increased, by virtue of its size and design the development would fail to respect the shape and scale of the host dwelling. It would appear as an incongruous addition within this pair and the wider roofscape. The rear roof alteration would not be visible from the street scene. However, it would be

visible from neighbouring properties due to the inward facing layout of the rear gardens of properties on the surrounding streets.

6. The appellant has provided evidence of development that has altered the roof form of 34 College Road, which the proposed development would be similar to. This is a single example of this form of roof alteration in the area and it has resulted in an unbalancing effect on the semi-detached pair in which it sits, and it is acknowledged that this alteration was undertaken prior to the SGCA appraisal. On the site visit it was observed that there are other examples of rear roof alterations on properties in adjacent streets, but these differ in size and design to that which is subject to this appeal. Furthermore, such alterations are not so prevalent along College Road that they are integral to its character.
7. For the reasons given above, the proposed roof level alterations would fail to preserve or enhance the SGCA. As the development would only be seen from a small part of the SGCA it would cause less than substantial harm. No public benefits have been put forward to outweigh this harm. The development would not accord with Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015- 2030. Policies CC1 and CC2 expect proposals to respond to the context and character of the area in terms of design. Policy CC4 expects development to conserve or enhance heritage assets and Policy SC7 expects residential alterations to complement the original building and harmonise with the adjoining properties.

Conclusion and Recommendation

8. For the reasons given above and having had regard for the Development Plan when it is considered as a whole, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

A Coombes

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Taylor

INSPECTOR