
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 May 2023

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/23/3317441

5 Firs Drive, Hounslow, TW5 9TA

- 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 Gurmeet Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00452/5/P7, dated 14 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 14 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Proposed single storey first floor side extension with a side facing dormer with two pitched roofs and two side facing windows and internal alterations. The vertical hanging tiles to the front elevation be reinstated.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, including on the Cranford Village Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The Cranford Village Conservation Area (CA) comprises of four distinct character areas, as identified within the Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA). The appeal property is within the Firs Drive Character Area. The CAA describes this area as an estate of well-maintained, detached and semi-detached houses, a number of which are located around small, attractive greens. The CAA identifies that an important feature of the estate is the spacing between the houses, which expresses the modest density of the development. All houses are of a coherent design and some are of exceptional quality.
4. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling, with a distinctive side catslide roof. Whilst at the time of my site visit works were been undertaken to the property, the dwelling is clearly reflective of the CA in terms of its original design and appearance and positively contributes to it.
5. The statutory duty in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) is of considerable importance and weight. Paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (the Framework) states, amongst other things, that the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and

distinctiveness should be taken into account in determining applications. Paragraph 199 of the Framework also advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to their conservation.

6. Policy CC4 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (2015)(LP) similarly expects development to conserve or enhance heritage assets. Policies CC1 and CC2 of the LP expect proposals to respond to the context and character of the area in terms of design, whilst Policy SC7 requires residential alterations to complement the original building and harmonise with adjoining properties.
7. The appeal property has been the subject of previous planning applications including the approval of an application¹ in 2022 which included the erection of two side roof dormers to the house (the previous approval). A larger single roof extension has subsequently been erected which does not benefit from planning permission. The current scheme proposes alterations to the as-built side dormer mainly by creating two hipped roofs above the windows, with a central recessed section. It also proposes to reinstate tiles on the front elevation and on the side roof extension.
8. The proposed side dormer would be highly visible in the street scene when approaching from the south west, due to the gap between it and Cranford Baptist Church. Although the side dormer would have two hipped roofs over the windows with a flat roof linking section, the recessed element would be so narrow such that it would have little meaningful effect in terms of breaking up the overall scale and bulk of the side dormer. Moreover, the eaves on the side of the house would not be retained such that the proposal would appear more as an incongruous two storey extension rather than as an addition to the roof. The proposed dormer by virtue of its width and depth would occupy a significant proportion of the side cat-slide roof and would, in my view, appear as a bulky, discordant and unsympathetic addition to the dwelling. The development would be highly dominant and visually obtrusive in the street scene and as such would be materially harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the CA of which it is a part.
9. The proposal would reinstate red hung tiles to the front elevation of the dwelling and the side dormer which would reflect the materials on the adjoining dwelling. However, this positive aspect of the proposal would not sufficiently mitigate the harm I have identified above.
10. I have had regard to the previous approval on the site for two side dormers and have noted that one of the dormers was similarly set on the eaves. However, the proposed side dormers would be higher, deeper and wider than those approved and would be linked by a flat roof section which would only be slightly recessed. In my view, the current proposal would add further bulk and mass to an extent that I consider would be harmful to the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the surrounding area, including on the CA.
11. For the above reasons, the proposal would have a negative effect on the significance of a designated heritage asset. Whilst the harm to the CA would be less than substantial, this is nevertheless a matter of considerable importance

¹ LPA ref. 00452/5/P5

and weight. The proposal would provide improved, enlarged living accommodation and would retain a family sized dwelling, however these considerations do not amount to public benefits that would outweigh the harm caused.

12. I therefore conclude that the development would have adverse visual effect on the host dwelling and the surrounding area, and as a consequence would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA as a whole. Hence, the appeal proposal would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and the Framework with regards to conserving and enhancing the historic environment. It would also conflict with the design and heritage aims of Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the LP.

Conclusion

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

J Davis

INSPECTOR