



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2025 by K Hole BA (Hons)

Decision by B Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/25/3365488

28 Princes Avenue, London W3 8LS

- 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 Mr Christopher Harry Johnson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2025/0213.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of hip to gable roof conversion, a rear roof dormer extension, installation of 2 roof lights to front and replacement of existing pitched roof to existing rear extension with a new flat roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The Conservation Area is focussed on two areas; Gunnersbury Park and Cemetery area of open land and, Gunnersbury Park Garden Estate where the appeal site is located. Gunnersbury Park hosts the mansion, small mansion, garden buildings, outbuildings and a park which hold special architectural and historic interest, while the Garden Estate is significant due to it being a complete and relatively unspoilt example of a 1920s garden suburb estate.
5. The appeal property is a two-storey end terrace dwelling, on a corner plot on Princes Avenue which is characterised by small blocks of terraced and semi-detached dwellings of similar scale. While there are several design variances between dwellings, there is an established character and appearance. This includes the prominence of hipped roofs as an original design feature to the semi-detached and end terrace dwellings. In having a hipped roof and being of traditional two-storey form, the appeal dwelling makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.

6. The proposed development includes a hip to gable roof conversion. On my site visit, I observed several hipped roofs that have been altered with side dormer windows and hip to gable additions. However, the majority of side dormers are set back from the front roof slope retaining the hipped roof form that is characteristic of the street scene. Given that the proposed hip to gable roof conversion would align with the front roof slope it would therefore appear more prominent than most other examples. The increased scale, mass and bulk of the hip to gable addition would result in a feature that would neither be subordinate to the appeal dwelling nor be in keeping with the established character and appearance of the street scene.
7. The other side of Princess Way is 30 Princes Avenue which also has a hipped roof. Given its proximity to the appeal property, the impact of the proposed hip to gable roof conversion would be accentuated due to a loss of uniformity to the roof scape. The appellant has drawn my attention to a side dormer extension at 18 Princes Avenue and has suggested that the proposed development would balance out the terrace. However, the proposed hip to gable extension would be larger and of different design. Moreover, the side dormer extension at 18 Princes Avenue retains the hipped roof design that is characteristic of the street scene. In any event, full views of the terrace are obscured by the presence of mature trees, therefore I consider the relationship between the appeal property and 30 Princes Avenue to be of greater importance.
8. Several nearby examples of gable roofs have been provided by the appellant to dwellings on Gunnersbury Avenue. However, these are not directly comparable to the appeal proposal because these properties instead have a prominence of gable roofs. Furthermore, the single example of 77 Princes Avenue is a considerable distance from the appeal site, and it does not contribute to the local street scene and fails to reflect the prevailing character and appearance of Princes Avenue.
9. The proposed development also includes the construction of a rear roof dormer. While the proposed dormer would be set down below the ridge line, set in from the roof edges and set up from the eaves, it would be large and would occupy most of the rear roof slope. There are several examples of rear dormers in the vicinity, many of which are of similar size and scale to that proposed. However, they have been built on mid-terrace properties in more inobtrusive positions whilst the host end terrace dwelling is visible from its front, side and rear.
10. While the rear dormer would not be uncharacteristic of the area, the hip to gable roof conversion would be required to facilitate it, which as noted above would harm the character and appearance of the street scene. Furthermore, due to the corner location of the appeal dwelling, the rear dormer would be partially visible from the public realm. Taken together with the proposed hip to gable conversion it would form a significant combined mass, resulting in a harmful effect on the street scene.
11. The Council have indicated that the two roof lights to the front of the host dwelling are acceptable due to the presence of other roof lights within the terrace and I agree. Furthermore, the replacement roof to the existing rear extension would be relatively discreet and would not have a harmful effect on the Conservation Area.
12. However, given the harm identified with regards to the hip to gable roof conversion and rear dormer, the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area.

13. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. While the proposed development would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area, the harm to this heritage asset would be less than substantial.
14. In these circumstances the National Planning Policy Framework requires me to weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposal. I note that the proposal would provide additional space for the occupiers of the appeal property, however this is a private benefit. I have not been provided with any substantive evidence of any public benefits associated with the proposed development that would outweigh the unacceptable harm identified above.
15. Accordingly, the proposed roof alterations would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and would fail to preserve or enhance the Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area. Consequently, the proposed development would conflict with Policies SC7, CC1, CC2 and CC4 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015) and the Character, Sustainability and Design Codes: Part A5 Residential Extension Guidelines. These seek to ensure, among other matters, that development is subordinate to and complements the original building, and responds well to the character of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Hole

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

B Plenty

INSPECTOR