



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2023

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 13 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/23/3325895

49 Harewood Road, Isleworth TW7 5HN

- 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 Arthur Sivanathan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00556/49/P7, dated 21 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as a proposed loft conversion, main dormer and roof alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the appearance of the building and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this 2 storey semi-detached house which is set within a residential area. The houses appear to date from the inter-War period and are mainly of similar designs which were originally built with hipped roofs.
4. The appeal property has been extended in the past with a 2 storey extension to the side, with a hipped roof which matches the original one. The proposal would seek to provide a part-gable to the original part of the front roof and a rear dormer. A hipped roof would be retained at the side, which would abut the newly formed part-gable at the front. It is clear from the submitted documents that the Council's objection relates to the front part of the proposal and I shall concentrate on this for my consideration of the appeal.
5. The Council has included reference to its publication 'Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document' (SPD) adopted by the Council in December 2017. Within section 4.10 the SPD states that permission will normally be refused for a proposal which includes the alteration of a hipped roof to form a gable due to the unacceptable unbalancing effect that it would have on a semi-detached pair of houses. The SPD adds that in situations where one house has a gable extension, as a result of permitted development, then it may be possible to acceptably extend the other house in the pair but

that an assessment of the effects on the street-scene and character of the property will be necessary.

6. The predominant roof form in the surrounding area is a hipped roof. There are a number of extensions including those with lower hipped roofs, flat roofs and some with gables. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of various examples and I saw these at my site visit. However, the attached house here, at No 51 does not have a first floor side extension and retains its original hipped roof. Additionally, I have no information before me about the planning history of any of the examples that have been referred to and cannot tell if they pre-date the Council's existing policies and SPD.
7. The proposal would result in a design of the roof where a hipped roof abuts the new part-gable. Not only would this unbalance the pair of houses, it would appear awkward. I am aware of a similar design nearby in this road but this only confirms my view that such a design would have an unacceptable appearance within this locality.
8. I have given careful consideration to the other examples of development within the area that the appellant refers to and to the effects that these have on the area, including any unbalancing effects. As stated, I have no planning history details for these examples and no information to say if there have been examples built as permitted development, with planning permission, which was built first or if they pre-date the Council's policies and SPD. What I can tell is that the great majority of houses in the area retain their original hipped roofs and a number of extensions have matched this original design. Those that do not conform with the prevailing character are relatively few in number and some of these do not have an acceptable effect on the locality, in my judgement. Therefore, these latter examples do not form desirable precedents that should be followed.
9. For the reasons given above, the proposal would fail to comply with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 and the SPD. I have taken account of all other matters and find nothing sufficient to outweigh that conflict. As a consequence, the appeal is dismissed.

T Wood

INSPECTOR