



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2023

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/22/3308121

16 Queens Park Gardens, Hounslow TW13 4JT

- 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 Sandeep Dhaliwal against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref: 00910/16/P2, dated 22 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable with a rear dormer and insertion of 2 roof lights and an outbuilding for storage purposes and a removal of tree in the rear garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the local area, including the St Dunstan's Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises one half of a semi-detached two storey property with a hipped roof. It is located at the end of a row of semi-detached properties whose form echoes that of properties in Vernon Road and the adjoining roads to the north. However, Queens Park Gardens lies within the St Dunstan's Conservation Area (SDCA) and as such the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires, in respect of development affecting conservation areas, that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area.
4. The St Dunstan's Conservation Area Appraisal 2018 explains that the special architectural and historic interest lies in its role as the historic core of Feltham, centred on St Dunstan's Church and Road. The large areas of green space create a backdrop to the built form and help to retain a sense of the area's rural origins.
5. The proposal would change the roof to a gable end and insert a large box style dormer to the rear. This would both unbalance the semi-detached pair and be at odds with the appearance of the surrounding area where hipped roofs are a consistent characteristic and are predominantly unaltered.
6. No.14 does have a similar box dormer and the roof form has been changed, however the Council advise that these alterations were made some time ago

and more than likely before the Conservation Area was designated in 2008. It was also prior to the introduction of the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document – Guide for Householders (SPD). Contrary to the advice in the SPD, the proposed dormer would cover the majority of the roof slope (as extended) and whilst it is slightly set down from the ridgeline and inset this is marginal. As a result, the dormer would dominate the roof and the property would have a top-heavy appearance. Additionally, as the end property with space to the side the alterations are more visually intrusive in the street scene.

7. The existing row of semi-detached properties make a neutral contribution to the SDCA. Whilst the proposed alterations would not impact on the significance of the SDCA in terms of its overall character, they would fail to preserve the architectural form and appearance of the row of properties.
8. The appeal scheme also includes a detached outbuilding to be located to the bottom of the garden. It would be of a domestic scale and reflect others found in the area. However, to accommodate the outbuilding a large tree located along the rear boundary would need to be removed. The appellant explains that the neighbours also seek its removal as it affects sunlight to their properties. From what I saw on site the tree is substantial and the surrounding properties to the north in Princes Road have gardens of a more limited depth. Notwithstanding this, by virtue of its conservation area location the tree is protected and given its size it does have some visual amenity value to the area. Be that as it may, no arboricultural details or any evidence to support the impacts on the neighbours' amenity have been submitted with the application to enable me to fully assess this aspect. Nevertheless, having already found against the proposal on the main issue this matter would not alter my decision.
9. In conclusion, the proposed alterations to the roof form would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host property and the local area. Accordingly, the proposal would be contrary to Hounslow Local Plan Policies CC1, CC2, and SC7 together with the SPD, which amongst other things, expect development to respect the character of an area, and for extensions to complement, be subordinate to the original building and harmonise with adjoining properties.
10. The harm to the SDCA as a whole would be less than substantial and in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) that harm should be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal. The alterations to the roof would enable enhanced accommodation for the occupiers of No.16, however this is primarily a private benefit and as set out a paragraph 199 of the Framework great weight is to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets. The proposal would therefore fail to conserve the SDCA in accordance with the Framework and Hounslow Local Plan Policy CC4.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR