



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2023

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th December 2023

APP/F5540/D/23/3326595

183 Ringway, Southall, Hounslow, UB2 5SU

- 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 Parminder Bansal against the decision of the Council of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00943/183/P5, dated 28 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 3 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is part double storey side extension, part first floor rear extension, single storey rear extension and skylight in side roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The area around the appeal site comprises a mix of semi-detached houses and small terraces set back from the pavement edge behind front gardens and paved drives. Groups of houses are generally linked by garden walls with gates providing access along their side to their rear gardens. Above them the gap between houses at first floor level provide open views of the sky and trees to the rear and are wide enough that the side walls of houses are clearly visible from the road. Both these elements contribute to the character and appearance of the area. When viewed from the street, the roofscape around the appeal site appears relatively unaltered except for a corner house nearby, and the appeal property which has an existing side dormer.
4. The appeal property is on the end of a small terrace. It has a front facing gable end which projects forward of its adjoining neighbour. This is mirrored by the property at the other end of the terrace providing an element of symmetry to it. However, that symmetry has been eroded by the side dormer, which the appellant acknowledges has unbalanced the appearance of the terrace. The appeal property also has a single storey flat roofed side extension which appears to have been recently completed.
5. The proposed development seeks to combine existing consents and add a first floor hipped roofed extension above the side extension. Its eaves would be level with those of the main house, but it's ridge would be below the main roof ridge.

Although it would be subservient, it would further complicate the roof profile, being out of keeping with the pitched roof front gable and flat roofed side dormer. The disparate roof forms would give an awkward appearance that would fail to harmonise with the existing house and amplify the unbalanced appearance of the terrace. It would be particularly conspicuous and harmful to the street scene because of the contrast with the unaltered roofs and side elevations elsewhere, and the loss of the first floor gap with the neighbouring house that I have identified as characteristic of the area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 to 2030 (2015) and the Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document - A Guide for Householders (2017) which require extensions to complement the original building and maintain the character of the street scene.

Other matters

6. I note that the roof has already been changed from its original appearance and that permitted development rights, to some extent, limit the Council's ability to control the appearance of roofs. Nonetheless, that does not alter my view that the additional harm that would arise from the proposed development is unacceptable. The appellant's example of planning permission granted by the Council at 259 Great West Road is for a first floor infill extension at the rear of that property, rather than a side extension. It is a different design and is unlikely to be visible from the street. As such, it is not comparable to the appeal proposal. In any case, I have come to my own view regarding the proposed development rather than relying on the approach the Council may have taken elsewhere.

Conclusion

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

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR