

Appeal Decision

Site visit undertaken on 2 February 2022

by J Somers BSocSci (Planning) MA (HEC) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision Date: 17TH February 2022

Appeal A Ref: APP/F5540/D/21/3285672

36 Worples Road, Isleworth TW7 7AR

- 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 David and Lucy Baverstock against the decision by the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application, ref. 01236/36/P5, dated 17 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as alterations to roof with rear dormer window, two front roof lights roof conversion over the rear outrigger.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/F5540/D/21/3285584

36 Worples Road, Isleworth TW7 7AR

- 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 David and Lucy Baverstock against the decision by the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application, ref. 01236/36/P4, dated 24 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as erection of side dormer in connection with the loft conversion including one roof light in the front roof slope and a rear outrigger extension.
-

Appeal A:

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B:

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter – Both Appeals

3. This letter deals with two planning appeals under s78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Whilst each of the appeals are to be considered individually under these processes, as the cases are for the same site, and are similar in their nature and considerations; to avoid repetition and for the avoidance of doubt, I have dealt with each of the appeals within this single letter.

Main issue – Both Appeals

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the locality.

Reasons – Both Appeals

5. The appeal site is located at the corner of Worple Road and Percy Road and is an end terraced property that turns the corner and has a frontage to both Percy and Worple Roads. The building is two storeys tall and constructed with London Brick, with a hipped roof with the building chamfered at the corner. The ground floor of the building has brick infill panels which appear to have previously formed a shopfront. The opposite corner and side of Percy Road, the form and design of the appeal building is mimicked with another building with a chamfered corner and also appearing to have a form and design of a former commercial building. Whilst it would appear that the Victoria Tavern further along the road is the last remnant of commercial operations in this Victorian street scene, the presence, design and form of the Victorian dwellings along Worple Road including their previous uses does contribute to the positive elements of character and appearance of the area.
6. The appeal site and the site opposite are prominent in the street scene and form characteristic buildings on each of the corners which contribute strongly to the character and appearance of the locality and give clues to their former uses with the older phase of development appearing along the east side of Worple Road and parts of Percy Road. The use of traditional materials such as timber, brick and slate along with the similar functional and domestic designs reinforce a uniformity and authenticity which creates a formal picturesque townscape with a tight knit urban grain along with vegetated front gardens that give a distinctive character.
7. There is a cohesion in building elements which appear to present as workers cottages constructed around the turn of the 20th Century with single bays, pitched rooves, large chimney stacks, and the use of brick facades and detailing, some of which have been painted. There is evidence of extensions to the rooves of dwellings such as those neighbouring the appeal site however many of the extensions are roughly proportionate to the existing dwellings and relatively inconspicuous from the public realm as one travels along both Percy and Worple Roads. To the west of Worple Road is a later phase of development with mid-late twentieth century development with pairs of semi-detached dwellings and newer apartment buildings present.
8. The appeal dwelling is part of the Victorian phase of development and appears to have had extensions to its existing form such as a single story rear extension, and infill panels to replace a former shopfront and changing in window locations along the Percy Road elevation. Whilst these alterations have been made in proportion with the building, elements such as the neighbouring parapet wall at roof level are quite tall and have a domineering presence to the street scene and the proportions of the appeal site.
9. The London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (LP) Policies CC1 and CC2 are design led policies which seek to achieve high quality design for new development which reflects the existing character and context of the locality. LP Policy SC7 is specific to residential extensions and seeks that extensions do not harm existing character and appearance and also seeks that the Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (SPD) is taken into account in planning determinations. The SPD contains further specific guidance in relation to design principles and detailed design considerations that for roof extensions places an emphasis on subservience and responding to the existing site and context of the locality.

10. Both appeals propose an additional level to the roof of the two storey rear wing. The main differences between the appeals is that Appeal A seeks that the ridge of the roof to the front of the building on the corner of Percy and Worple Roads is elongated in order to change the pitch of roof form from a shallow to a steep pitch which according to the Council would be from 51 degrees to 84 degrees. Appeal B maintains the existing roof form of the building, however proposes a side dormer window to the Percy Road roof elevation.
11. Given the prominence of the appeal building within the street scene, proposed alterations to the side and front facades needs careful consideration. In both appeals, the addition of another level to the rear wing would remove the majority of the existing roof form and would give a top-heavy appearance which would be detrimental to the proportions, form and authenticity of the existing Victorian building. The extension would not be subservient to the existing dwelling and would accentuate the poor visual appearance and dominance of the parapet wall along the shared boundary with further increased bulk and massing which would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the locality.
12. Turning to Appeal A, there is a continuity of the design and proportions of the building, particularly with the building on the opposite side of Percy Road which is a bookend to the appeal dwelling. I disagree with the applicant's Statement of Case (SoC) that the profile and overall built form is able to be visually absorbed without distracting from the wider built form. The elongation of the ridge and the changing of the pitch of the roof creates a bulky and awkward appearance which would present as an asymmetrical addition when experienced in the street scene along with the building opposite and would be very visible indeed. Whilst I agree with the applicant's SoC that the overall height of the ridge would not change, the increased bulk and massing of the extension would be an awkward addition that would not be sympathetic to the building or reflect the authenticity and proportions of this particular building. Consequently, the proposed alterations, on their own and also when combined with the proposed extension over the rear wing would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and the locality, contrary to LP Policies CC1, CC2, and SC7, of which are supported by the SPD.
13. Turning to Appeal B, the use of dormer windows on road facing roof planes is uncharacteristic of these particular dwellings found within this area which take a more functional and simple Victorian appearance. The proposal for a dormer window is uncharacteristic in this sense and would result in elevating the status of the dwelling and introducing elements which are inauthentic and overcomplicate the proportions of the functional appeal dwelling.
14. I note in the applicant's SoC that there are details of other dormer windows in the greater surrounding area¹ however these dormer windows are not analogous to the characteristic corner Victorian property or contain similar design considerations to the appeal site. As such the presence of these dormer windows does not add weight to the acceptability of this proposal.
15. For similar reasons as to Appeal A, the proposal would not be a subservient alteration and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the

¹ Labelled in the Applicant's SoC as Talbot Road; Amyard Cottages, Percy Road

host building and the locality, particularly when experienced with the building opposite. Consequently, and in conclusion of this matter, in both appeals, the proposed alterations, on their own and also when combined with the proposed extension over the rear wing would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and the locality, contrary to LP Policies CC1, CC2, and SC7, of which are supported by the SPD, as described previously.

Other Matters – Both appeals

16. I note comments in the Applicant's SoC with regards to the lack of representations from neighbouring residents to the proposal. The lack of objection does not mean that the development is acceptable when assessed against the policies of the development plan. I have assessed both of the applications on their merits which has shown to be contrary to the policies of the development plan.
17. There are also comments regarding the reference to 'longer views along Percy Road' and that the variance in building form which in the applicant's opinion views along the Percy Road street scene as not particularly attractive. Considerations around elements such as character, appearance and local distinctiveness go beyond what is 'attractive' and considers things such as architectural authenticity and integrity, design features, elements, form, massing and layout amongst others. Whilst the views along Percy Road may not be as attractive as one, for example, in a conservation area; there are elements which are positive such as the tight knit form of dwellings, the symmetry gained via the setbacks, roof forms, materials and functional design which contribute positively to the street scene.

Conclusion – Appeals A and B

18. For the reasons given above, and having considered all other matters raised, Appeals A and B are dismissed.

J Somers

INSPECTOR