
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/23/3320136
56 Broad Walk, Hounslow, TW5 9AB

- 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 Jagjeet Singh Corana against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00162/56/P6, dated 13 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 27 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is extension of side dormer at first floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an extension of side dormer at first floor level at 56 Broad Walk, Hounslow, TW5 9AB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00162/56/P6, dated 13 February 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan; XEVA/56BW/701A; 702A; 703A; 704A; 705A; 706A; 707A.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the semi-detached pair and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling, located in a road comprising of similar properties. It forms a pair with 54 Broad Walk which is of a similar design and appearance although the appeal property has been altered by way of a hip to gable extension. Both dwellings have a flat roof dormer extension on the side roof slope of their flank elevations although the dormer on the appeal property extends further to the rear. The proposal is to extend the existing side dormer forward towards the front elevation by about 2 metres.

4. The side catslide roof is a distinctive feature of the original design of the semi-detached dwellings, although in the case of the appeal property, the hip to gable extension has already altered the original roof form. In my view, the proposed dormer extension would be set back from the front elevation by a sufficient distance to ensure that part of the side roof slope would remain evident. The dormer extension would be more visible in the street scene than the existing dormer due to its forward projection and views of it would be obtainable through the splayed gap between the appeal property and 58 Broad Walk. However, I find that it would sit comfortably on the side roof slope with the main gable end above and would not be an overly dominant or incongruous feature of the dwelling.
5. The semi-detached pair are already unbalanced as a result of the existing hip to gable extension at the appeal property. Whilst the proposed dormer extension would extend closer to the front elevation of the dwelling than the dormer on the side of No 54, I do not consider that it would result in any additional significant unbalance between the two dwellings. In my view, the prominent 2 storey bays and attractive projecting window to the side would remain the most prominent features of the front elevation of both dwellings.
6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not result in material harm to the host dwelling, the semi-detached pair or the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would comply with Policies CC1 and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (2015) (LP) which expect proposals to respond to the context and character of the area in terms of design and Policy SC7 of the LP which requires residential alterations to complement the original building and harmonise with adjoining properties. It would also be consistent with the aims of the Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2017) in this regard.

Conditions

7. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans condition is imposed for certainty. A condition requiring the use of matching materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Conclusion

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

J Davis

INSPECTOR