



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2023

by A Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 October 2023.

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/22/3304421

1a Turpin Road, Feltham TW14 9HR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr S Kumar against the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref P/2022/1223, is dated 11 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is rear facing dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission for a rear facing dormer is refused.

Procedural Matters

2. The appeal relates to a planning application that was not determined by the Council within the prescribed period. Following the lodging of the appeal, the Council has not provided an officer report or statement of case. I have therefore formulated the main issue in this appeal on the basis of the limited evidence before me as well as my site visit.
3. Neither the Council nor the appellant has provided me with any extracts from the Council's development plan. I have therefore considered the appeal with reference to the relevant provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
4. The appellant indicates that they are open to amending the dormer dimensions. However, it is not the purpose of an appeal to engage in discussions over alternative designs. In the interests of fairness, I must determine the appeal on the basis of the drawings before me, and on which interested people's views were sought.

Main Issue

5. I identify that the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the rear dormer on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site lies at the end of a two-storey terraced building which is situated in a prominent position perpendicular to Staines Road to the south, and between Turpin Road to the east and White Bridge Close to the west.

7. There is a very large existing dormer at the adjoining property No 1, which is currently the only dormer on the terraced building. I do not have any details of the planning status of this structure, but it does not, in my view, contribute positively to the terraced building and surrounding area.
8. Much like the existing dormer at No 1, the proposed dormer would be a substantial structure occupying the majority of the rear roof slope of the property. Its size and box-like form would appear excessively large, and together with its large window/door openings and balcony, would not be in keeping with the proportions and fenestration of the original building. The lack of separation to the existing dormer at No 1 would further compound the harm through the cumulative bulk of both structures. These harmful effects would be highly apparent in near and distant views from White Bridge Close and Staines Road.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed rear dormer would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. Thus, the proposal does not accord with paragraph 130 of the Framework, which requires that developments are visually attractive, sympathetic to local character, and will add to the overall quality of the area. In addition, paragraph 134 of the Framework states that development that is not well designed should be refused.

Other Matters

10. I am satisfied that the proposal would not cause any harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers through loss of privacy. I also recognise that the additional living accommodation that would be created would be of benefit to the occupiers of the appeal property. Nonetheless, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified and the conflict with the relevant provisions of the Framework.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR