



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2024

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/24/3345823 182A Wood Lane, Isleworth, TW7 5EH

- 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 Lamba against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Reference is 01225/182A/P1.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear roof extension incorporating a hip to gable roof conversion, first floor rear extension, and three roof windows to the front of the house.
-

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 property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached home in a generous plot on a narrow lane in an area of one-sided residential development which faces school playing fields. The wider area is of established residential character with varied designs and ages of usually good quality suburban dwellings which along with their gardens and local landscape all come together to create a neighbourhood of very pleasing appearance. The proposal is as described above.
 4. The site lies within the Osterley Park Conservation Area. There is a duty imposed by Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requiring decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. The Council's Local Plan (LP) Policy CC4 reflects this. LP Policies CC1, CC2, SC7 and the objectives of the 'Residential Extensions Guidelines' are also all relevant to the case. Taken together and amongst other matters they seek to secure development which would display good quality design, complement and be subordinate to the original building, reflect local distinctiveness, and not have excessive massing.
 5. Having considered matters carefully I would say that the upper level with its sheer bulk would become most ungainly, would not display subservience to the
-

original structure and would appear 'top heavy'. The gable ends would create an excessive and uncharacteristic scene from the front which would also sit uncomfortably with the forms of the existing forward and side projections to the property. There is no doubt that hipped roofs are the norm along this stretch of road and their existence adds to the pleasing, generally low key, street scene. Furthermore, the rear dormer would appear as too large a box-like form reaching too closely to all edges of the roof. It would lack any semblance of good design and when combined with the unorthodox planned crown roof form of the lower extension to its rear would lead to a jumbled and unattractively awkward arrangement at this upper level.

6. In summary, the roof changes would be excessive and cumbersome and would lack suitable subtlety in relation to this house and its generally attractive location; there would be adverse impingement upon the aesthetic qualities of this home and the wider area.
7. Given the foregoing I conclude that the change proposed would be contrary to the aims of Section 72(1) and would conflict with the development plan policies and Guidelines which I cite in paragraph 4 above.

Other matters

8. I do understand the Appellant's wish for additional accommodation. I would agree that the scheme would not detract from residential amenity for neighbours. I can see that thought has been given to the use of matching materials and, like the Council, I would not have issues with roof lights in isolation.
9. Two nearby larger buildings, flats, were drawn to my attention and I can understand why the Appellant feels that these may be out of place and incorporate roofs which, whilst generally hipped, could be said to include some characteristics of the appeal proposal. I do not know the full planning background behind these structures; however, they are different in nature to the scheme before me in form and scale and I would not hold these as buildings which should set a design benchmark for this part of the Conservation Area. In any event I must assess this case on its own merits and my reasoning is set out above.
10. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
11. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) have been considered. Key objectives of the Framework are to protect and enhance the qualities of the built environment as well as to safeguard heritage assets; development plan policies which I cite mirror these. The Framework underlines that great weight should be given to a heritage asset's conservation. The appeal proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset however what public benefits there would be would not outweigh this harm. Furthermore, there are no other benefits, including to the Appellant, which to my mind would be of a scale to outweigh the harm to the Conservation Area which I have identified.

Overall conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR