
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2025

by **C Housden BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/24/3354456

277 Popes Lane, Ealing W5 4NH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Skyklass Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/1460.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a side roof dormer extension and installation of one front roof light to the house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development provided by the appellant only refers to the proposed side dormer window. I note that a front rooflight is also proposed on the plans. In the interests of precision and clarity, I have therefore used the Council's description of development from the decision notice in the banner heading to capture both elements of the proposal.
3. At the time of my visit, I observed that extensions to the appeal property had been constructed that are not depicted on the existing and proposed plans before me. This includes a dormer extension on the opposite side roof slope and a dormer extension on the rear roof slope. I understand from the evidence before me that this is in connection to planning permission Ref P/2024/0378. I also noted that the rooflight on the front roof slope of the proposed plans had also been completed and was in-situ.
4. Despite the two existing dormer extensions not being shown on the plans, I am satisfied that I have sufficient information before me to determine this appeal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing building and the area, including the Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

6. The appeal site is situated within the CA and in accordance with the statutory duty set out in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas)

Act 1990, I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA.

7. The Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area Appraisal (2018) (CA Appraisal) describes that the CA is focused on two areas. The first being Gunnersbury Park and Cemetery. The special interest from this area derives from the architectural and historic merit of the mansion, small mansion, garden buildings, outbuildings and park. The second area is the Gunnersbury Park residential estate. The special interest of this area lies in the complete and relatively unspoilt 1920's garden suburb estate development. Specifically in relation to Popes Lane, the CA Appraisal states that this area is included within the CA due to backing onto the park, meaning that extensions to these properties could affect the park and its skyline.
8. Popes Lane is located within a residential area primarily consisting of two-storey detached and semi-detached properties with consistent architectural features, including two storey front bay windows. Properties are set back from the roads with open frontages and are organised in a uniform pattern following a mostly linear building line. A number of properties have been extended, some of which include the use of dormer windows.
9. No 277 Popes Lane is a two-storey detached property with a rear and a side dormer window along with a rear extension. From Gunnersbury Park, the rear and side roof slopes of No 277 and the other properties along Popes Lane are visible above the fence line separating the park from the properties. No 277 currently appears in keeping with the other properties along Popes Lane forming the skyline of the northern boundary of Gunnersbury Park. No 277 is therefore a neutral contributor to the CA.
10. The proposed side dormer would have a crown pitched roof, be set down from the existing ridge and set well above the eaves of the existing roof. It would be finished with hanging tiles to match the existing dormers. The proposal would however add additional bulk and mass to the roof of a property which already has enlargements to its opposite side and rear roof slope.
11. I find that the addition of a further dormer would therefore add additional massing causing the roof to become unduly bulky and would materially harm the character and appearance of the host property and the wider streetscene.
12. The proposed dormer would be visible from Gunnersbury Park and affect the skyline along the northern boundary. The cluttered and bulky roof space of No 277 resulting from the proposed development would be out of character and make the appeal property appear unduly prominent within the CA. As a result, the proposal would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the CA. I assess that this harm would be less than substantial.
13. Paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposed development. I have not been presented with a public benefits case.
14. In relation to the front rooflight, the Council has confirmed in its officer report that they raise no objection to this element of the proposal. This is due to the rooflight being centrally positioned and in a conservation style. I have no reason to disagree with this reasoning. Nevertheless, whilst I may not find material harm regarding this

element of the proposal, I have still found harm to the character and appearance of the existing building, wider area and CA from the dormer extension.

15. For the reasons I have given, the proposed development would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. It would also be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing building and to the area. The proposed development would therefore conflict with Policies SC7, CC1, CC2 and CC4 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015). These policies seek to ensure that development is sustainably designed to a high standard and preserves and enhances the historic environment.

Other Matters

16. I acknowledge the appellant's concerns over the Council's handling of the application. However, this is not a matter that I can consider under a Section 78 planning appeal and does not alter my findings, in which I have had regard solely to the planning merits of the proposal.
17. The appellant has also highlighted examples of dormer extensions within Popes Lane, including some properties with dormers on both side roof slopes. However, rather than these extensions providing justification for the development in question, their presence points to a need for such proposals to be carefully controlled if the character and appearance of the area is to be safeguarded.
18. Furthermore, I have been supplied with limited information with regard to these examples as to whether planning permission has been obtained or the context of the development in comparison to the appeal proposal. As such a comparison is of limited relevance in this instance.
19. In any case, I have considered the appeal before me on its individual planning merits and the presence of these examples do not persuade me that the appeal proposal is acceptable or otherwise justify the harm that I have identified in respect of the scheme.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Housden

INSPECTOR